

The Theatre of Empire

Douglas S. Harvey

Number 13

THE THEATRE OF EMPIRE: FRONTIER
PERFORMANCES IN AMERICA,
1750–1860

EMPIRES IN PERSPECTIVE

Series Editors: *Tony Ballantyne*
 Duncan Bell
 Francisco Bethencourt
 Caroline Elkins
 Durba Ghosh
Advisory Editor: *Masaie Matsumura*

TITLES IN THIS SERIES

- 1 Between Empire and Revolution: A Life of Sidney Bunting, 1873–1936
Allison Drew
- 2 A Wider Patriotism: Alfred Milner and the British Empire
J. Lee Thompson
- 3 Missionary Education and Empire in Late Colonial India, 1860–1920
Hayden J. A. Bellenoit
- 4 Transoceanic Radical, William Duane: National
Identity and Empire, 1760–1835
Nigel Little
- 5 Natural Science and the Origins of the British Empire
Sarah Irving
- 6 Empire of Political Thought: Indigenous Australians and the
Language of Colonial Government
Bruce Buchan
- 7 The English Empire in America, 1602–1658: Beyond Jamestown
L. H. Roper
- 8 India in the French Imagination: Peripheral Voices, 1754–1815
Kate Marsh
- 9 British Narratives of Exploration: Case Studies on the Self and Other
Frederic Regard (ed.)

10 Law and Imperialism: Criminality and Constitution in Colonial India and
Victorian England

Preeti Nijhar

11 Slaveholders in Jamaica: Colonial Society and Culture during the
Era of Abolition

Christer Petley

12 Australian Between Empires: The Life of Percy Spender

David Lowe

FORTHCOMING TITLES

Anglo-Spanish Rivalry in Colonial South-East America, 1650–1725

Timothy P. Grady

Royal Patronage, Power and Aesthetics in Princely India

Angma Dey Jhala

THE THEATRE OF EMPIRE: FRONTIER
PERFORMANCES IN AMERICA,
1750–1860

BY

Douglas S. Harvey



LONDON
PICKERING & CHATTO
2010

*Published by Pickering & Chatto (Publishers) Limited
21 Bloomsbury Way, London WC1A 2TH*

2252 Ridge Road, Brookfield, Vermont 05036-9704, USA

www.pickeringchatto.com

All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise
without prior permission of the publisher.

© Pickering & Chatto (Publishers) Ltd 2010

© Douglas S. Harvey 2010

BRITISH LIBRARY CATALOGUING IN PUBLICATION DATA

Harvey, Douglas S.

The theatre of empire: frontier performances in America, 1750–1860. – (Empires
in perspective)

1. Performing arts – Appalachian Region – History – 18th century. 2. Perform-
ing arts – Appalachian Region – History – 19th century. 3. Imperialism in
popular culture – Appalachian Region – History – 18th century. 4. Imperialism
in popular culture – Appalachian Region – History – 19th century. 5. Theater
in propaganda – Appalachian Region – History – 18th century. 6. Theater in
propaganda – Appalachian Region – History – 19th century. 7. Appalachian
Region – Colonial influence.

I. Title II.

Series 306.4'84'0974'09033-dc22

ISBN-13: 9781848930278

e: 9781848930285



This publication is printed on acid-free paper that conforms to the American
National Standard for the Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials.

*Typeset by Pickering & Chatto (Publishers) Limited
Printed in the United Kingdom at MPG Books Group, Bodmin and Kings Lynn.*

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ix
Introduction	1
1 'Glory and Commerce' at the 'Edge of the Woods'	13
2 The Corn Mother and 'Rising Glory'	41
3 Thunderbirds and Happy Indians	69
4 Circus, Theatre and the Frontier: Class and Empire	101
5 Colonizing Folk Culture	127
6 Evening Star Medicine meets Uncle Tom	155
Conclusion	175
Notes	179
Works Cited	207
Index	225

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The efforts of many people went into creating this book. Any historian knows how important a good archivist is, and I have been fortunate to work with some of the best. The staff at the Harvard Theatre Collection, the Library Company of Philadelphia, the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, the Ohio History Centre, the Missouri Historical Society, the Kansas Historical Society, Spencer and Watkins Libraries at the University of Kansas and Ablah Library at Wichita State University have been instrumental in helping me through the maze of their bawliwicks.

This project began as a PhD dissertation at the University of Kansas. I must express gratitude to the History Department there - Thomas Lewin was the very helpful Chair at the time - for providing me with gainful employment and guidance while I explored the seed of this idea. The University of Kansas history graduate student dissertation writing group cannot know how much they helped by listening to and reading my inchoate ramblings; the late Becky Robinson, Ana Patricia Fumero-Vargas, Jeff Bremer, Steve Sodergren, Marina Maccari and others provided moral support in the darkest days of graduate school.

The efforts of a handful of scholars who helped nurture this project along when it was still in its nebulous stage deserve special mention. Mechele Leon, Rita Napier, Donald Worster, Paul Kelton, Surendra Bhana and Jonathan Earle all gave me invaluable feedback in the earlier stages of this project. Scholars Kathleen Wilson and Norman Caulfield have provided the moral support much needed when writing a book that ventures into relatively new territory.

Many other hands facilitated this book in so many ways. Frank and Amanda Lengel provided lodgings and good company while I did research in Ohio. Janet Garner, Nathan Garner, Nick Garner and Natalie Ehrlich all provided valuable moral support throughout the project. Eric and Marco Napolitano were there to lighten the load and remind me that there is a world beyond my computer screen. Ruth Hoff's persistent question, 'So how's the book coming?' was appreciated throughout the course of this odyssey. Most of all, I owe more thanks than I can express to my able research assistant, guidance counsellor, confidante and wife, Kathleen Hoff, whose unflagging support, manifested in every conceivable

way, has enabled this book to happen. Many grateful and humble thanks to all these people and more too numerous to mention; my apologies for not including them all in this space. Of course, for the shortcomings this book no doubt has, I alone bear responsibility. Finally, I humbly dedicate this book to four very important people who represent the future: Maizlin, Marco, Izzy and Vaughn. May your lives be blessed by a warm intimacy, with both human and 'other-than-human persons'.

INTRODUCTION

The renewed activity of US corporations and the military support provided to them in the aftermath of the Vietnam War has inspired some historians to return to studying the history of empire, particularly in the years since the 9/11 attacks and the invasion of Iraq. The role that the mainstream media and popular culture played in winning popular support, particularly for the invasion of Iraq led by the US, is well documented.¹ From the use of pro-war Generals as ‘impartial’ news analysts to the *Sturm und Drang* of the news programmes themselves, the invasion was presented as a war on tyranny and the only reasonable course of action. The fact that Saddam Hussein’s career originated on the CIA payroll and that he was assisted by US aid was never mentioned. Mainstream news outlets were vocal about his use of poison gas on the Kurds in the 1980s but silent on the fact that he bought the gas from a US corporation with the blessing of the Reagan administration. The weapons of mass destruction that would allegedly create a mushroom cloud over New York if we did nothing were known not to be there by weapons inspectors before the invasion, but the mainstream media ignored this. Prime time television programmes such as *24* rationalized and even glorified the use of torture. It was hard to read a newspaper, watch television, or even go to a sporting event without encountering a narrative that assumed the invasion was on the side of the angels. In the aftermath of this flurry of militarism, it seems compelling to ask when this cultural support for what is now generally called ‘American Empire’ began and what this support initially looked like.

This book engages the myth-making qualities of frontier performances to establish a spectrum of assumptions and study how they work to perpetuate, or resist, imperial expansion. The myth-making and myth-perpetuating qualities of performances make them useful for studying the history of the assumptions embraced by societies.² In this case the focus is on indigenous and colonial societies of the late colonial, revolutionary and early republic period in English-speaking North America to the Civil War. In surveying this spectrum, I look at performances ranging from the rituals and ceremonies of indigenous peoples to the theatre culture of the colonial society.

The focus of this book is to discover what imperial culture, in the form of performance, looked like *qua imperial*. In this endeavour it seems reasonable to ask to what extent the propensity for conquest was built into the political economics of the society itself. Indeed, colonialism – the process of occupying and appropriating the land and resources of an indigenous population (and in this case the labour of involuntary colonists) – is at the very heart of so-called western society. To this day, the ‘Empire’ is dependent upon the exploitation of labour and resources to maintain its currently tottering economy. That this system is not only bankrupt but unsustainable is a point at last coming home to all but the most recalcitrant observers. For example, the observation that with five percent of the world’s population, the US consumes twenty-five percent of the world’s resources while producing about one third of its pollution has almost become a cliché in some circles. These are, as writer and activist John Perkins has pointed out, the properties of a failed system, a system that certainly cannot be adopted universally.³ What, culturally, has prevented the majority of people from responding to this situation? What, historically, created this culture of denial, wilful ignorance and repression?

The vast majority of the initial concentrations of wealth in the US, as in other imperial economies, was produced by expropriating the land of the indigenous inhabitants of North America, the forced labour of these ‘Indians’ and Africans, or both. Some argue that the triumph of Enlightenment rationalism overshadows these injustices.⁴ However, the awareness of the scientific process, discovery and the constructive application of these ideas through technology could have proceeded without the profound destruction visited upon Native Americans or via the Atlantic slave trade. There are numerous examples of coexistence between indigenous peoples and colonists as well as colonists who embraced indigenous culture. What fuelled the attitude of conquest was the desire to obtain massive material wealth and accompanying political power. Whether one characterizes the resulting system as mercantilism or capitalism, the striving for individual wealth and power couched in the pursuit of the national interest, employing technological developments, religious justification and the normalizing of this process by a growing imperial culture has been the engine driving these developments. It is to the last of these that this study turns its attention.

Empire, for the purposes of this study, is defined as the colonial expansionism inherent in the libertarian economics of the British Empire and its scion, the United States. This includes economic and military expansion, linguistic dominance in the renaming of geographical features and even of people, and the use of debt and reward to coerce those whose land and resources the economic titans desired.⁵ The proverbial ‘market economy’ reduced the independence of the indigenous peoples of North America by coaxing them into abandoning traditional skills for European manufactured goods. This dependence proved to

be their downfall, more so than disease or war, because it enabled speculators, jobbers, government officials and others to ply the Native Americans with these goods while sometimes slowly, sometimes quickly appropriating their land base. If negotiations failed to achieve desired results, the military was brought in to force the issue. As historian Kathleen Wilson observed in her study of empire and the popular press of England, 'empire was at heart about trade, commerce, accumulation, and consumption, and as such augmented national, as well individual standing, wealth and power.' It also fed ethnocentric formulations of power as well as enthusiasm for the exotic and primitive; and it legitimated empire to its 'domestic customers.'⁶ This was also the case in the Anglo-American Empire of North America.

The analysis and critique of this empire has, of course, been going on as long as the empire itself. Since the Second World War, literary and cultural scholars were among the first to argue that the United States was an empire from its beginnings. Dating back to Lionel Trilling's *The Liberal Imagination* and Henry Nash Smith's *Virgin Land*, a body of historical literature that resisted the assumptions of imperial economics blazed a trail that historians have increasingly acknowledged and followed.⁷ By the 1970s, works by Richard Slotkin, Robert Berkhofer and others confronted the mythic dimension of American historical thought, serving a function not unlike that of Charles Beard earlier in the century: confronting imperial views of violence, hegemony and economics that were cloaked in a mythic rhetoric of nationalism.⁸ Recent literary scholars have continued the trend. Felicity Nussbaum, Amy Kaplan, Donald Pease and Andy Doolen have all focused on America as empire.⁹ Increasingly, historians are also coming to this conclusion. Works by Walter Nugent, Fred Anderson and Andrew Cayton, as well as Andrew Bacevich, have acknowledged that American Empire existed from the beginning and conquered North America before it sought resources and markets elsewhere.¹⁰

Catherine Hall, Kathleen Wilson and Ann Laura Stoler have significantly interrupted the traditional narrative of British and US history as spreading Enlightenment rationalism, giving 'new imperial history' a place at the historiographical table. It is no accident that women should be in the vanguard of critical imperial studies, having been marginalized for much of this history. In addition to their own writing, each of these scholars has edited at least one anthology that delves into the race, class and particularly gender aspects of imperial repression.¹¹ What is particularly potent about these works is their attention to how empire affects, disrupts and re-orders the most intimate details in the lives of ordinary people. Rape, slavery, national identity, narrow definitions of citizenship and the interaction of oppressed peoples to breed resistance are all hallmarks of empire; as are shadow governments, manipulation of patriotic sentiment and institu-

tionalized deceit. These phenomena are increasingly well documented in this emerging critique of empire.

The history of Indian/White relations is central to this study, spanning as it does the frontier line. In this area, recent works by Cynthia Cumfer, David Andrew Nichols and an older book by Dorothy V. Jones have helped set the stage, as it were, for the present study. Cumfer has engaged a topic that is increasingly difficult to dismiss: that there was indeed an indigenous (and African American) discourse in the period of the early American republic. Nichols has provided a needed nuance that is neatly summed up in the title of his study *Red Gentlemen and White Savages*. He explains some of the complex difficulties the first US government faced regarding Indian/White relations on the frontier. Jones's study of Indian treaties and how empire was furthered by them is a political and diplomatic history of material I approach in a cultural context.¹² The legion of treaty minutes, ethnohistories and ethnographies that provide much of the source material for the present study are too numerous to summarize here, but they can be found in the book's endnotes and bibliography.

As much as this seeks to take a place in the literature of critical imperial history, it is perhaps even more embedded in the discourse of ritual and theatre performance. What makes this study unique is that it compares and contrasts the entire spectrum of performance from indigenous rituals to colonial and national theatre on and near the cultural frontier of British and Euro-American expansion with a critical eye to the process of empire. In this regard, the separation of 'indigenous' from 'colonial' and the point where the transformation from one to the other occurs is key.

When referring to the 'colonial', I am using the adjectival form of the concept of control by a culturally foreign power over an indigenous, dependent area or people, or policies advocating such control.¹³ The use of the adjective 'indigenous' refers to the native, or 'that which is produced within' a particular region, to extrapolate from the Old Latin origins of the word. Representations of the indigenous culture are found in the local environment, and they display an intimacy with the resource base absent in colonial culture. Important in the dichotomy between indigenous and colonial is that the colonial culture, politics and religion are definitively non-native. In North America during the period of this study, the expanding colonial empire 'practised' a religion originating in the Mediterranean and Near East that centred on an omniscient Semitic god of war. This empire bore mores, philosophies and folklores that emerged in the European environment. North America, to the purveyors of empire, was seen as a source of wealth, power and independence from old regimes. Policy makers, whether British or Euro-American, put libertarian economics and the pursuit of resources and markets ahead of considerations that those focused on the 'indigenous' worldview might choose. For natives, not only was religion entwined with

all other aspects of daily life, it involved local phenomena. The equivalent of the Europeans' Bible stories took place not in Damascus or Galilee, but in Lake Erie, or in the Alleghenies, or under the Platte River. The resource base, to use a colonial expression, had not been de-sacralized as it had for those following the Hellenic-Judeo-Christian-Islamic view of the world. In this Manichean view, many immigrants to North America were as dogmatic about Classical concepts as they were about religion; indeed Humanism was a descendent of Hellenism. As economic empire increased its influence in the New World, the commoditization of resources, including the land itself, became an assumption which spread into the homes and villages of some of the indigenous peoples. Profit, and power for acquiring more profit, were placed above all else. Where, for example, the women leaders of the Iroquois Confederacy weighed decisions based on their potential impact on future generations, imperial power-brokers weighed decisions based on maximizing profit-potential in the immediate future. I hasten to add that I am not arguing that this was a Manichean world of evil Europeans *versus* benevolent Native Americans. These are concepts I am defining, not people I am describing. Many Europeans expressed deep concerns over long-term impacts of policies, and many Indians pursued their own short-term gain. But generally speaking, the concepts of 'indigenous' and 'colonial' provide useful analytical tools for assessing the impact of economic empire in North America and, more importantly for this study, how the performances on the frontier both revealed and created the expression of the colonial and indigenous and helped shape the identities and assumptions associated with each.

Historians and literary scholars have marked the beginning of an association between the theatre and the rising market economy as early as the Elizabethan period in England. For example, Jean-Christophe Agnew's *Worlds Apart: The Market and the Theater in Anglo-American Thought, 1550–1750* is an analysis of the theatre and the market in Tudor and Stuart England. Agnew shows how these institutions grew together as the market became more abstract and theatre became more commercial. Elizabethan and Jacobean theatre, operating within the expanding market economy, helped to 'explain' to its audiences the new economic system that arose out of the 'Mediterranean System' of trade. In so doing it created what Agnew calls 'another nature', an artificial world in which the market and the theatre became increasingly abstract entities. The market became abstracted in the sense of moving away from being a specific *place* to a way of doing business through investments and commodity manipulation. The theatre became abstracted in the sense of moving away from a numinous ritual based on seasonal events associated with rites of passage, ceremonies and agriculture,¹⁴ to representing individuals engaged in the culture of an abstract market economy. This culture, a way of life constructed around the transaction and the contract,

is what I am calling 'colonial', which is to be taken synonymously with the terms 'culture of empire' or 'imperial culture', terms I frequently use in this study.

The transformation of the market from a *location* to a *concept* was pregnant with empire's need for expansion. The spread of this concept through society was abetted and accompanied, Agnew shows, by its long time companion on the fringes of English traditional society: the theatre. Individuals within this empire increasingly saw themselves in ways that came to be defined, in part, by these two entities that had existed as 'worlds apart' from the medieval farm and village.¹⁵ It was also, I argue, a world apart from the indigenous paradigm where the human and the non-human were unified. Agnew established that from the outset of the late medieval and Renaissance eras, theatre and market economics became joined at the hip. As this economic system grew and the demand for more natural resources and markets increased so did the push for national expansion, and such demand was reflected in theatre performances.

In theorizing and defining the interpretation and analysis of the 'indigenous' quality, the present study relies on the fieldwork of anthropologists, especially A. Irving Hallowell, Frank Speck, Adrian Tanner, Gene Weltfish as well as religious scholars Kenneth M. Morrison, Benson Saler and Lee Irwin.¹⁶ These scholars have all struggled with the problem of using western linguistic and ontological constructions to describe non-western phenomena, a perennial issue in cultural studies. As literary critic David Scott observed, 'Postcolonialism has been concerned principally with the decolonization of representation: the decolonization of the West's theory of the non-West'.¹⁷ While there was no specific science of anthropology as we understand it today, there were a few astute observers in this period who wrote down some of their experiences, supplying most of the historical record of Native American performance. There is, nevertheless, a paucity of sources illustrating the contrast between the colonial performances of the Anglo colonists and the indigenous performances of Native Americans. As a result, I include examples drawn from other periods, both before and after the period under discussion, but from nevertheless a very similar cultural context to the historical moment under consideration. The danger of drawing ahistorical conclusions is noted and appreciated, but the goal is to establish a spectrum of performance between indigenous and colonial cultures. To that end, I believe this justifies venturing briefly out of the immediate time period under examination at times.

From the scholars mentioned above (and others), studies of indigenous cultures range from sixteenth-century New France to twentieth-century Labrador. While indigenous American cultures were as many and varied as those of pre-modern Europe, there were certain qualities that were fairly common and provide an 'indigenous' paradigm to serve as a foil to the 'colonial' in this comparative study. A. Irving Hallowell, for example, was convinced that there was

an 'indigenous' paradigm in North America. He was convinced that, contrary to assumptions projected onto them by colonial culture, the Ojibwa peoples he studied had no concept of the 'supernatural'. There were forces that were 'extraordinary' and differed from the 'ordinary' in their power, but there was no differentiation and therefore no terminology for a supernatural / natural dichotomy. Forces which acted on humans, Hallowell observed, were considered equal to humans; indeed, the English word that Hallowell's subjects used in translating the concept of these forces was 'person'. 'Persons' are entities that have power; that is, they can exert their influence on other entities. Some 'persons' are human and some are not; some you can see, some you cannot. The important point is that they have agency and need to be respected. These 'persons', including humans, are a part of the Universe, which has intelligence.¹⁸ The obvious and important contrast with the culture of the expanding empire during the period under study is that 'persons' were human only. Humans were placed on a pedestal by the culture and religion of the colonists and *that* is at the heart of the 'colonial' view – that humans were above and could conquer the forces that acted on other species. That human agency, especially since the Industrial Revolution, has been growing in its seeming domination of the planetary unit as a whole, through technology, driven by the acquisition of resources, markets and, at base, private material gain, is not controversial. That this domination may have serious consequences for all the 'persons' on the planet is a central issue of our time.

The conundrum of cultural history is how to reliably describe a past reality given the paucity of sources that typifies investigations in this area. This is particularly true for audience studies. Studying 'rival representations', like 'colonial' and 'indigenous', has value in that it can reveal how one group imposes, or attempts to impose, its values on another. Representations in the social sphere 'give unconscious expressions to the positions and interests of social agents as they interact'¹⁹ and describe society as those agents saw it. Creating assumptions also imposes order to a depth beyond the ability of any physical coercion, and in that regard this book is a study of the varieties of *mentalités* operating on the frontier of North America. This book is not, *per se*, a Foucauldian or *Annalistes* study of culture, although it is certainly influenced by those bodies of theory. This study is epistemologically shaped not only by the scholars mentioned above, but also by recent developments in the field of cognitive studies. In this regard, theatre historians Bruce McConachie and F. Elizabeth Hart have both written essays and jointly edited an anthology on the potentialities of cognitive studies in cultural history.²⁰ I have found their discussions of 'reliable epistemology' involving 'simulation' and 'embodiment' – concepts adapted from cognitive studies – particularly compelling. Two aspects of lived discourse seem missing from studies of cultural history: experience and the acknowledgement of *embodied* subjectivity – that is to say, the presence of the mind in the body as

representing a body of knowledge not disconnected from the body but centring on it. Neither postmodern relativity nor objectivism acknowledges embodied experience, and this lack of embodiment is central in the separation of colonial from indigenous discourses. As Hart and McConachie observe, the attention to textual representation as the basis of an imperfectly understood reality on the one hand, and a naive positivist historical epistemology that strives for a Historical Truth on the other have dominated cultural history to this point. Neither seems satisfactory in moving the conversation of cultural history forward. Hart and McConachie turn primarily to the joint work of linguist George Lakoff and philosopher Mark Johnson for a scientific basis for their episteme.

This work is focused on maintaining a connection between linguistic, literary and other cultural phenomena and the presence of the body as their *a priori* source. The human body contains our 'sensorimotor apparatus, which enables us to perceive, move, and manipulate', and 'the detailed structures of our brains which have been shaped by both evolution and experience'.²¹ Hart elaborates on the use of this notion in theatre and performance studies, developing the idea of 'embodied realism'. In a statement that is key to the theoretical construct of the present study, helping to blaze a path forward past the impasse of relativism and positivism, she observes that:

Both our experience of reality and our knowledge of that reality are contingent upon the brain and mind's shaping by the body, which is itself shaped by evolution and by the particularities of its experience. The relativity this gives rise to, however, is limited in degree since the body's particular experiences and the knowledge those experiences beget are both constrained by a positively experienced reality (positively in the sense that there really is a reality out there), specifically, by the cultural, historical, and environmental conditions in which the body is embedded.²²

This acknowledgement of 'environmental conditions' is the keystone in my own epistemological construction for this book. What I am proposing is to utilize a combination of this vein of cognitive studies as applied to theatre and performance events and view toward – or ignorance of – the environment in which our bodies are imbedded. As noted, differences in the performances in the times and places studied here can be charted on a continuum ranging from the 'indigenous', where the entire cultural milieu of the performances are embedded in the environment of the participating bodies; to the 'colonial', where the environment is notably absent or limited to the immediate spatial dimension that locates the performance.

Another important aspect of cognitive studies, adapted from the work of philosopher Robert Gordon that is useful to cultural historians is the idea of 'simulation'. Bruce McConachie explicates this usefulness in his critique of Eric Lott's groundbreaking book *Love and Theft*. In this book, Lott employs a psy-

choanalytical analysis of blackface²³ ‘wench acts’, and McConachie contrasts this with a description of a ‘simulation’ approach to historical analysis. In the simulation approach, the historian asks himself what it might have been like to see a white man dressed up as a black woman, acting the part and to suddenly see ‘big feet or strong knees’ erupt from under the wench’s dress. That the historian can know, understanding the cultural context of the time and through the empathetic projection of their own experience and humanity into the eyes of the audience, what that experience may have been like, albeit in a limited way, is the essence of simulation. The identification of the audience with the ‘true’ person, in this case the white male actor, under the blackface make-up and the dress, is an identification that the historian shares, although removed temporally and spatially from the event. McConachie cites historian Christine Stansell’s observation that, in the context of the 1840s and 1850s, females were gaining autonomy at home and in the workplace, creating a renegotiation of ‘what, exactly, men and women owed each other’. White, male, working class audiences, who had grown up in an environment where women had less autonomy, would have appreciated this representation of ‘putting females in their place’.²⁴ In terms of empire, I would add that the derisive depiction of black women as both prostitutes and slaves in these wench acts maintained an assumption of white supremacy and a rationale for slavery and the slave trade. As others have noted, this was a structural element in American imperial culture before, during and after the Civil War. Simulation is, in sum, the reasonable and intellectually honest projection of the historian’s experienced judgement into past situations to overcome the limitations of objectivism and relativism. This ‘breakthrough’ in the use of cognitive studies to help provide a reliable epistemology is a welcome opportunity to critique what is, by these definitions, a colonial paradigm that continues to *in-form* conversations in cultural history. In other words, scholars have been forced to use these colonially-constructed (that is, detached from the environment) concepts to describe the imperialist nature of the paradigm. Critics of power structures like Michel Foucault themselves employ a detached epistemology (‘colonial’ by my definition) to describe the power structures embedded in modern institutions. His discussions of these embedded power structures have been vital in the evolution of our understanding of that topic. However, nowhere in the writings of the main theorists of cultural history, to my knowledge, is the mention of this embedded-ness of the body in the environment – the vital role of the resource base in the existence of humanity. One must turn to what I am calling an ‘indigenous discourse’, the conversation with the environment that humans sustained for millennia before the de-sacralization of the world took us down the path we are currently on.²⁵

The results of the ‘colonial discourse’ are striking. The ‘indigenous discourse’ enabled human beings to flourish, to varying degrees, for hundreds of thou-

sands of years. In a matter of centuries, a discourse that detaches humans from their bodies and places us on a pedestal above our fellow creatures and hence the environment, has fouled the waters, is poisoning the air, destroying mountains and spreading destruction on a massive scale. The difference between these two discourses centres on the reality that the body, home of the brain, must be fed. In colonial discourse, the mind exists independently of the body. There is no acknowledgement that these deep and complex discussions of philosophical moment would not be happening if the source of food failed. Food, the connection between mind, brain, body and the earth, does not, in a meaningful sense, exist in the colonial discourse. In the indigenous discourse, food is the centrepiece of the vast majority of performance activity and the society-at-large. This is not because people are starving or near starvation, but because it is central to their world view. This is why, simply put, when the colonists became the dominant culture, the health of the environment deteriorated, sometimes at breakneck speed. From Socrates and Aristotle to Kant and Saussure to Foucault and Derrida, the acknowledgement of the absolute necessity and vitality of the resource base – food – is missing. The indigenous world view builds this into its everyday life. Ceremonies welcoming the sunrise, acknowledgements of the sacred act of taking a life for food, seasonal cycles of ceremonies such as the Green Corn Ceremony gave thanks and expressed humility for the gift of sustenance. With the arrival of the colonists' mercantilist and capitalist systems, these natural resources and many others were counted as commodities, to exist at the whim and for the exploitation of those who financed and coordinated that exploitation. The vitality and absolute necessity of food and honouring its source was included, if at all, only as an afterthought, in the performances, discourses and religions of the colonists. This split between the colonial and indigenous, as manifested in the embodiment of discursive systems and revealed in performances, is the fulcrum point of this study.

Critical views of this epistemic approach will no doubt attack it as simply another historian romanticizing Native American culture. I wish to pre-empt this potential criticism by stating that Indians were and are human beings just like those of us of European descent. The cultures of pre-modern societies, American, European or other, is not what this study seeks to 'defend'. Indeed, if this study is defending anything, it is the earth itself, which is and has been under an onslaught of profit-seekers with little or no concern for the natural heritage they have inherited and consumed at a dear cost to unborn generations. There are elements embedded in indigenous cultures that place humans, rightfully, in their realistic setting. Henry David Thoreau's writings at Walden Pond describe serene nature, a world in which humans are mystically attuned to the infinite. But once thrust into the reality of having to obtain sustenance from nature, a deeper perspective is needed. This is the world of the 'indigenous'. Some years

after his stay at Walden, Thoreau hiked up Mount Katahdin in Maine, where his western mind encountered phenomena that induced ‘a virulent attack of metaphysical dread.’ Thoreau later described the experience of Katahdin as ‘a place for heathenism and superstitious rites – to be inhabited by men nearer of kin to the rocks and wild animals than we.’ This is the world of the indigenous. ‘Think of our life in nature – daily to be shown matter, to come in contact with it – rocks, trees, wind on our cheeks! The *solid* earth. The *actual* world. The *common sense*! *Contact! Contact!* Who are we? *Where* are we?’²⁶ We are on the earth; indeed, we *are* the earth. But we have forgotten this most visceral of facts, and we have forgotten it because it is missing from our repertoire of myths and assumptions. This book is an effort to explore how this vital piece of mythology was suppressed and, by implication, how it might be restored.

1 'GLORY AND COMMERCE' AT THE 'EDGE OF THE WOODS'

There was a stark contrast between the myth-making performances on the frontier of the indigenous American societies and the expanding British Empire in North America. The theatre stage, the ceremonial performances at treaty negotiations, and the ritual performances of the indigenous peoples represented a wide range of world views. From the colonial performances that elevate economic empire to near-religious status to the ritual interpersonal tributes found in 'Indian Country,' the spectrum of performances found in the 1750s set the tone for future indigenous/colonial paradigm shifts and interactions, thus providing a base from which to begin this survey of that spectrum. This chapter examines three types of performances: student and professional performances in Philadelphia, the largest town on the empire's periphery; indigenous performances that focused on establishing relationships and, finally, the intercultural performance events represented by treaty ceremonies.

During Christmas of 1756, the College of Philadelphia presented *Alfred*, a masque by James Thomson, set to music by Thomas Arne. This was deemed an appropriate play for a performance by young men in a town divided about the theatre in general, although the scenes of the romance between Alfred and his future queen Eliruda were cut to avoid agitating the large Quaker population. The editor of the *Pennsylvania Gazette* wrote upon the serial publication of the play in that newspaper:

There is, through the whole, a Sublimity of Sentiment, a Love of Liberty, and a Concern for the Commerce and Glory of Great-Britain, scarce equalled by any thing in our language. Add to this that it is most peculiarly adapted to our present Circumstances, and tends directly to inspire that true Heroism and public Spirit which are founded on a just Dependence upon Providence and the Favor of Heaven.¹

By 1756, the imperial conflict for the resources of the Trans-Appalachian West between England and France, with Spain in a secondary role, was underway. The project to take Fort Duquesne at the head of the Ohio River had met with defeat with the death of General William Braddock and the retreat of the survi-

vors led by Lieutenant George Washington. Government support for imperial expansion for the benefit of an economic elite group was nothing new, but it was entering a new dimension with the French–Indian War. In 1756, the interests of British planters and land speculators had suffered a setback from French and Indian resistance west of the mountains, and ‘public-spirited’ British citizens would be needed to redouble the expansionists’ efforts. The phrases ‘tends directly to inspire that true Heroism and public Spirit’ and ‘just Dependence upon Providence and the Favor of Heaven’ conflated public virtue and religion with imperial expansion. *Alfred* presented this process in a way palatable to those rank and file citizens whose blood and treasure would be required to bring this expansionism to fruition. The editor of the *New Hampshire Gazette* also sang the praises of *Alfred* in his publication in March of 1757. The *Gazette* editor wrote that it was an honour ‘to see these talents and improvements reserved for the most exalted subjects, and bestowed for none but the noblest purposes!’²

Thomson’s masque was clearly drawn from the contemporary history of the real Alfred written by his aide, the Welsh monk Asser, whose manuscript survived into the eighteenth century. While most of the *Gazette*’s characterization of *Alfred* can be found in this history, the term ‘Commerce’ is notably absent. A reading of this history reveals that, like the play, Alfred and his brother Ethelred had driven a Danish army from West Saxony at the Battle of Ashdune, near Reading, in 871. This was a portion of the island dominated by Germanic tribes who had forced the resident Celts and Picts out when they emigrated from northern Europe a few centuries earlier. The primary foe of Alfred and the Christian Saxons during his reign was the ‘pagan’ Danish army.³ Alfred, King of the Anglo-Saxons, was also reportedly passionate about establishing and protecting monasteries and facilitating education in the liberal arts. Asser discusses at some length Alfred’s penchant for education and how this enabled him to be a virtuous judge during his reign.⁴ Conquering the ‘pagans’; uniting ethnic groups such as the Angles, Saxons, Mercians and Armoricans; and providing virtuous leadership dominate the brief biography, making Alfred a logical choice to glorify British expansion in the 1730s, when the play was first published.

But eighteenth century imperialism was of a different character than the activities of Alfred in the ninth century. In Thomson’s play, the pursuit of resources and markets by the Empire is conflated with the ‘Sublimity of Sentiment’, a ‘Love of Liberty’, the ‘just Dependence upon Providence and the Favor of Heaven’ of Alfred, ninth-century champion of West Saxony. This British ‘history play’, along with others of this type, thus unites and historicizes the perceived glory of the indigenous Saxons under Alfred with the activities of an imperial project centred on the acquisition of wealth for the bourgeois merchant class.⁵ This conflation is one of the hallmarks of imperial culture of British North America. In this case, not only is virtue placed on profit and the acquisition of

material wealth ('Glory and Commerce'), but the heart of this colonial culture is the transaction itself. As will be shown, whether land speculation, the fur trade or the sale of manufactured goods to the Indians, it could all be normalized through the notion of Britain's 'Glory and Commerce'.

In the play itself, Alfred had been living in obscurity in the countryside when his confidence and resolve to rise up against the Danish invaders are restored by a blind bard. He then summons forth the courage to retake the island from the foreign invaders. Thomson's King Alfred of ninth-century Anglo-Saxon England sings the song that would become the anthem of the British Empire:

When Britain first, at Heaven's command,
Arose from out the azure main,
This was the charter of the land,
And guardian angels sung this strain
'Rule Britannia, rule the waves;
Britons will never be slaves.'⁶

The Danes were an ancient enemy of the English dating back to the mythic past. *Alfred* helped to both codify and perpetuate this past in the changing present of the early modern empire. The British navy was the key to 'ruling the waves', and *Alfred* reflected a rationale for 'righteous' conquest called forth from the perceived glorious history of nascent Britain. Imperialism depicted in this fashion on a theatre stage created a sort of template into which a playwright or manager could fit any potential enemy. It was the kind of construction that both formed and revealed the assumptions of the public mind, or at least of the imperial orthodoxy. In reality, empire in North America in the eighteenth century meant invading the 'Liberty' of numerous peoples who found themselves in the 'Dane' slot of this imperial template.

The first successful theatre troupe in the colonies was known as the London Company, later the American Company, and after the Revolution the Old American Company. It was initially led by Lewis Hallam, then David Douglass, and after the war by Lewis Hallam, Jr and John Henry. Arriving in Williamsburg in 1752 with a repertoire of twenty-four plays, they are treated in much of the earlier historical literature in hagiographic fashion.⁷ While the 'legitimate' or 'polite' theatre was establishing itself in the southern colonies, the cultural environment north of the Mason-Dixon Line was less receptive.⁸ There, college plays could often serve as vehicles for the Thespian arts with the rationale that they were a heuristic device for imparting rhetoric and public speaking to the next generation. As the first provost of the College of Philadelphia, William Smith wrote: 'Ever since the foundation of the College and Academy in this city, the improvement of the youth in oratory and correct speaking, has always been considered an essential branch of their education.' These college plays also allowed

aspiring Thespians and their elder allies to minimize disapprobation from the anti-theatre segment of the population.⁹

Graduating students at the College of New Jersey (Princeton) in 1762 performed a 'recited dialogue' written by Francis Hopkinson, a future signer of the Declaration of Independence. The *Dialogue* is a paean to the recently-crowned monarch George III, the 'Thrice happy Monarch! Skill'd in every Art,' that calls out the *Ode*:

Bright ascending in the Skies
 See Britannia's Glory rise!
 Cease your sorrows, cease your Fears!
 Night recedes and Day appears!
 Another George majestic fills the Throne,
 And glad Britannia calls him all her own.

Under this benevolent and blissful rule:

Rough War shall humbly at his Feet
 Her bloody Laurels lay;
 Him gentle Peace shall kindly greet
 And smile beneath his Sway.
 The Britain! Hail these golden Days!
 Illustrious shalt thou shine:
 For George shall gain immortal Praise;
 And, Britain! George is thine.
 To distant Times he shall extend thy Name,
 And give thy Glories to a deathless Fame.¹⁰

These students were reciting a theme in the colonial culture of empire, the 'rising glory' of Britain under George III, a monarch who supported a heavy-handed combination of government and pursuit of resources and markets.

But the glory of Anglo-Saxon England was not the only historicized empire presented on theatre stages. The 'glory' of Greece and Rome, conveyed westward by the perceived enlightening force of Empire – formerly Roman, now British, but developing a new scion in North America – fed the cultural and political rise of both the British Empire and Euro-Americanism.¹¹ '[T]is said, the Arts delight to travel Westward,' Benjamin Franklin wrote to Mary Stevenson in London.¹² *Translatio Studii* (or just 'Translation'), was the name for this phenomenon and the rediscovered texts of the classical world seeded European and Euro-American minds with concepts of politics, literature, theatre, music, and the scientific inquiry of the 'collegium'. Political ideology born of Aristotle, Plato and Polybius had migrated from the Italian city-states to England via the writings of James Harrington in the seventeenth-century. Harrington's *Oceana* spawned political debate that resulted in the English 'Country' Radical school of political thought

which was heavily influenced by Greek democracy and Roman republicanism.¹³ This scion of classical republicanism, in addition to the rationalist liberalism of Bacon, Hobbes and Locke, and notions of an Ancient Constitution resurrected by Sir Edward Coke, gave British North American colonies a language of self-identity by the mid-eighteenth century.¹⁴ Indeed, whenever a library, hospital, college or other public facility was dedicated, officials would often cite the 'advent'rous Muse', the 'light of Athens' or some other classical reference in their speeches and public writings. This is best captured in the oft-quoted 'Westward the course of empire takes its way,' from Reverend George Berkeley's poem celebrating an effort to found a college in Bermuda.¹⁵ On a Maryland theatre stage in 1760, the speaker of the evening's Prologue made it clear that the classical muse of comedy, Thalia, was clearly on the side of the British:

Here, as we speak, each *heart-struck* Patriot glows
 With real Rage to crush *Britannia's* Foes!
 O'er takes his Sun, communicates his Fires,
 And rising Bards in Western Climes inspires!
 See Genius wakes dispels the former Gloom,
 And shed's Light's Blaze, deriv'd from Greece and Rome!¹⁶

The Empire was a transplanted culture that brooked no compromise with the indigenous American world. Virginian George Mason wrote in a letter 'To the Committee of Merchants in London' that paraphrased the 'Epistles' of Horace: 'In crossing the Atlantic Ocean, we have only changed our climate, not our minds: our natures and dispositions remain unaltered.'¹⁷ Anglo-North America was an outpost of a European discourse – a nascent regional empire within a far-flung global empire that was embracing the assumptions of imperial projects dating back over two thousand years. Reifying old ideas to meet new circumstance only increased with European expansion and the rise of what would eventually be called liberalism.¹⁸ It is significant for the future of the continent that the native inhabitants of North America were never seen for who they really were, but were judged and condemned for their lack of European institutions. The Anglo-Saxons, Ancient Greeks and Romans were considered the valid cultural precedents for British Euro-America. A caricatured form of indigenous American culture, discussed below, made its way into Anglo-American consciousness as the colonies drifted toward political separation from Britain. In reality, the British Empire imported not only manufactured goods, but a cultural paradigm and religion they had borrowed from the Near East and Mediterranean that was used to rationalize expansionist designs captured by the phrase 'Liberty, Commerce and Glory'. Commercial theatre was part of this paradigm and, for the most part, it served imperial goals.

In the culture of the expanding empire, the working and merchant classes were expected to be as productive as possible and serve the 'commerce and glory' of the Mother Country. Violations of this polite code of fastidiousness were grave. This was performed in *The London Merchant*, a play by George Lillo debuted in 1731. A jeweller by trade and member of the London merchant class, Lillo's dedication to his MP Sir John Eyles who, among other things, helped raise the South Sea Company out of insolvency, is an indication of the solidarity of the rising merchant class with commercial theatre.¹⁹ Regarding the moral obligations of drama, he attributes to playwright John Dryden the statement that tragic poetry was 'the most excellent and most useful kind of writing, the more extensively useful the moral of any tragedy is, the more excellent that piece must be of its kind'.²⁰ Usefulness was key to Lillo as he summoned forth the concept of utilitarianism, apparently in common circulation, in this dedication some seventeen years before the birth of Jeremy Bentham:²¹

[T]hat tragedy is so far from losing its dignity by being accommodated to the circumstances of the generality of mankind that it is more truly august in proportion to the extent of its influence, and the numbers that are properly affected by it. As it is more truly great to be the instrument of good to many, who stand in need of our assistance, than to the very small part of that number.²²

Citing the precedent of the moral reforming of Shakespeare in *Hamlet*, Lillo said that while many of the Restoration and post-Restoration dramas had served as a moral reform impulse for the bourgeois and 'ruling' classes, there was a decided need for reform literature aimed at the lower classes – apprentices, for example.²³ Lillo's *The London Merchant or, The History of George Barnwell* is a moral instruction play based on a folksong known as 'The Ballad of George Barnwell'.²⁴ In both the play and the ballad, Barnwell is a young apprentice who finds himself taken captive by his amorous feelings for a *femme fatale*. By the end of Act I:ii, the corrupting temptress (Sarah) Millwood has Barnwell under her spell. This parallels the pace of the ballad, but ballads routinely 'cut to the chase', while such a development so early in the play seems contrived and wooden. The resulting impact is a kind of pastiche of market society values overlaying a traditional folk narrative. This becomes an increasingly common tool in the culture of empire as the notion of the market society as providing opportunity for the acquisition of private wealth expands to include a broader segment of society. In both texts, Millwood ultimately corrupts Barnwell completely. In the play, she talks him into murdering his Master for money, whereas in the ballad the Master is spared but Barnwell himself contrives to steal money from his uncle to maintain favour with Millwood. The discovery of the crime by the uncle leads Barnwell to 'beat his brains out of his [uncle's] head,' making Barnwell a fugitive. Millwood ultimately betrays Barnwell, but in the ballad, he reports her to the sheriff

for abetting the murder and she is hanged. In both, Barnwell is also executed. The play depicts Barnwell as betraying the bright future his loyal master had initially seen in him. The ballad gives Barnwell more agency and Millwood is more clearly the culprit, Barnwell being at the mercy of his immature love/lust and misplaced desire to provide for her. The play's appeal to the bourgeois class seeking production and loyalty from the hired help is apparent, and the popularity of this 'domestic tragedy' reflects the demand for its myth-making properties in both the metropole and the provinces.²⁵ Lillo's play was also influential in the development of the early stages of melodrama in Europe, especially Germany. These 'sentimental' dramas, like *The London Merchant*, with Manichean characterizations reminiscent of folktales, developed into the 'fairy tale' melodramas of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.²⁶

Such moral instruction, in addition to justifying theatre to its opponents, served to bifurcate colonial consciousness from its involvement in the buying and selling of slaves, the usurpation of lands in the Old and New Worlds, and the amassing of fortunes thus obtained, while large numbers of people, native and foreign, suffered acutely from the adverse consequences. In the New World, it is true that working class and yeomen colonists tended to fare better than their compatriots in the Mother Country, but only because Africans, African Americans, and Native Americans suffered the brunt of the capitalist / mercantilist economy in their stead. The relative egalitarian society that existed in colonial North America was a white-skinned citizenry, originating abroad, living on wealth produced predominately by a largely dark-skinned underclass and living on land usurped, often violently, from dark-skinned people who were seen as a foreign presence in their own homeland. It was an imperial society that championed social fluidity, individual rights (for white males) and, most strenuously, libertarian economics. This paradox became institutionalized because theatre, in part, made the latter of these into societal assumptions while sugar-coating the crimes and abuses. The resulting mythic structure became the 'Glory, Liberty, and Commerce' of Britain.

But what of the societies that resided on the lands coveted by commercial empire? What can their rituals and performances tell us about their world view and their differences with and attitudes toward the Europeans? Insights that might be gained from the juxtaposition of these two cultures have not been explored to a great extent. Seeing colonial performances with those of indigenous peoples serving as a foil is an illuminating exercise. For example, a study of the common indigenous performance, the 'Edge of the Woods', ceremonial performance alongside the expectations of the colonial Dutch community of New Netherlands reveals the assumptions of the two cultures and the disharmony of the resulting mythic outlook. In this instance, the indigenous performance commenced when a party of Dutch colonists from Fort Orange (modern Albany,

New York), approached the principal Oneida town in the Iroquois Confederacy. When the visitors were still several miles from the village, an Oneida woman brought them a meal of baked pumpkins as a welcoming gift and to give them energy for the final steps of their journey. When they arrived at the village, a welcoming procession formed in which the townsfolk welcomed the visitors by forming a sort of parade route into the village by forming two lines through which the Dutch passed. They were then escorted to one of the Longhouses, given food and a place to rest near the fire. In the gift economy of the traditional society, the visitors were expected to reciprocate with presents brought to the hosts. In this example, when asked what they had brought, the Dutch bluntly replied that they 'just came for a visit'. The Dutch traders were tone deaf to the Indians' performance, and were often seen as somewhat uncivilized by their Iroquois neighbours. The Oneidas informed the Dutch that the French, who knew how the gift economy worked, had left them valuable goods which were pointed out.²⁷ At the heart of this performance was not a business transaction, but the giving of gifts designed to establish good relations from the outset. The exemplary behaviour of the French would serve to exacerbate relations between the Indians and the British, who often exhibited a disdain for Indian culture similar to the Dutch, at a later date.

Like all indigenous performances, the 'Edge of the Woods' ceremony was grounded in pragmatism. In this instance, the party that brought the baked pumpkins could also reconnoitre the size of the incoming group, their intent and their firepower. If the visit was indeed peaceful, cordial relations were hopefully cemented by the ceremony and gift exchange. In the indigenous paradigm, forces having agency were, as illustrated above in the case of the Ojibwa, labelled 'persons', with some having more agency than others, and only a small subset of these 'persons' being human beings. In this example the Dutch represented a force to be appeased, being ritually given obligatory payments of respect – manifested in material form – by the community. The 'Edge of the Woods' was an indigenous performance designed to establish relations at a particular encounter with entities possessing agency and power, the same as any other entity, human or otherwise.

The Jesuit Pierre Charlevoix made some notes regarding indigenous performances in the 1720s. He observed that because of the bounty of fish the Indians procured from Lake Erie, they had made it into a divinity of sorts. Charlevoix wrote: 'I am however of the opinion, that it is not to the lake itself but to the genius that presides over it, that they address their vows'.²⁸ The lake itself, in the indigenous view was, because of its agency, a 'person' and thus in need of 'respect payment'. This example illustrates the difference between the colonial religion and the indigenous world view. Charlevoix's deity was supernatural, existing outside of 'nature' but exerting control over it. In the indigenous world view,

anthropologists like A. Irving Hallowell have shown that concepts of 'supernatural' that might be found among indigenous peoples were most likely imported from colonial culture. The indigenous paradigm had no natural / supernatural dichotomy.²⁹ Agency, as experienced on a personal level, was the determining factor in the power of a person, human or other-than-human. Lake Erie's power is easily described today by anyone spending a winter with the 'lake-effect' snowstorms in Buffalo, New York, or its cool summer breezes in Cleveland, Ohio. Charlevoix witnessed the Indians' performances that were designed to acknowledge and show respect for the power of Lake Erie, but power and agency could be found in 'persons' of any kind, seen and unseen.

In describing a Potawatomie ceremony that venerated the bear, as well as the ceremonial nature of the hunt, Charlevoix's description is useful in accentuating the nature of an indigenous world view:

The head of the bear, after being painted with all sorts of colours, is set during the repast in a conspicuous place, where it receives the homage of all the guests, who celebrate in singing the praises of the animal, whilst they are tearing his body in pieces and regaling themselves with it. These Indians have not only like all the rest a custom of preparing themselves for great huntings by fasting, which the Outagamies carry as far as ten days running; but also whilst the hunters are in the field, they often oblige the children to fast, they observe the dreams they have during their fasts, and from them they draw good or evil omens, with respect to the success of the hunting. The intention of these fasts, is to appease the tutelary genii of the animals they are going to hunt; and they pretend that they make known in dreams, whether they are to oppose or to be propitious to the hunters.³⁰

Like most Europeans, Charlevoix had difficulty reconciling the veneration of the bear with slaughtering, butchering and eating it. But this underscores the pragmatic nature of indigenous ritual performances in general; the Indians paid tribute to the bear because the loss of his life sustained their own. This is so basic and obvious that those steeped in a market culture, where everything is a commodity with a monetary price, had and still have trouble taking it seriously. It has been well established for some time that indigenous Americans relied heavily on their inner lives to find direction for both the individual and the group. Hunting and processing an animal for food, planting, harvesting and warfare were often determined by the dreams and visions of individuals. Their unity with the natural world around them was an integral aspect of their world view, manifested in their rituals and performances that the Europeans, with their Near East religion that did not involve daily affairs or the natural world to this degree, did not understand and therefore often disdained.

The 'Edge of the Woods' was performed by the Woodland peoples of North America in different ways and it appears many times in the historical record, particularly at treaty talks – another time when there were 'persons' to be appeased.

Arguably the most authentic record of the historical practice of this ceremony is recorded in the *Iroquois Book of Rites*, an oral tradition recorded in writing in the eighteenth century and handed down through the generations since that time. The 'Edge of the Woods' is recorded there in its extended version known as the 'Condolence Ceremony'. This account was edited by ethnologist Horatio Hale and originally published in 1883. Hale was gathering information at the Six Nations' Reserve in 1879 when two officials, Sakahengwaraton (Chief John 'Smoke' Johnson), characterized by Hale as the 'Speaker of the Great Council' of the Iroquois, and Chief John Buck, official record-keeper of the Iroquois Confederacy, gave two copies of the book to Hale. Its provenance seems to have been rooted in the work of 'David of Schoharie', a Mohawk who fought with Sir William Johnson against the French during the French-Indian War. The Jesuit Missionaries had worked out an orthography for the 'Iroquois' tongue around the turn of the eighteenth century. By the middle of that century, English missionaries had begun teaching the writing of that language to the Indians, something the Jesuits had not done, and one of their students was David of Schoharie. The Council Elders asked David to record the songs and speeches of the 'Edge of the Woods' and the 'Condolence' ceremonies, two of the most widely dispersed ceremonial performances among the eastern woodland peoples. Both the Mohawk and the English translation are given in Hale's edition of the *Iroquois Book of Rites*.³¹

Hale was a highly regarded nineteenth-century ethnologist and linguist, respected by white and Indian alike. He pointed out that Sakahengwaraton's position was unknown to the ancient 'constitution' (Hale's term) of the *Kanon-sionni* (Iroquois), but was a seat appointed by the British government with the Indians' consent. The distorted translation of his name 'Smoke' illustrates the difference in priorities of the colonial and the indigenous. The name 'Sakahengwaraton' is a term referencing the autumn mist that descends on the eastern woodlands during autumn nights and exists as a heavy fog until the rising sun then evaporates it in the morning. This is something very different from 'smoke', and this is emblematic of the disregard for capturing the true spirit of the indigenous meaning in many translations, cultural and linguistic, into the colonial tongue.³²

The 'Edge of the Woods' and 'Condolence' performances – really just one combined ceremony – was most often used upon the death of a Council member or other public official who played an important role in the Confederacy. Affected individuals ceremonially had their 'tears dried' and their 'throats and ears unstopped' by performing the ceremonial songs and commiserating with them. They would then be able to see, hear and speak clearly in order to help themselves and the community move forward. The songs included in these performances, called 'karena', were known to all and recited the history of the

ceremony. Each line was considered a song unto itself, packed with meaning, and followed by a collective 'haihaih' saluting the blessings they enjoyed and the reverence for the laws and for the dead as well as sympathy for the living. Hale observes that this is a striking departure from the 'self-glorification and defiance' typical of the Europeans' and Euro-Americans' national anthems.³³ It captures a dichotomy characteristic of the broader indigenous-colonial divide.

These ceremonies originated in the historical mythology surrounding the creation of the Iroquois Confederacy. The basic story is of Deganiwidah, the Peacemaker, who had appeared in a vision to Hiawatha, a man in deep grief over the loss of his daughters in repetitive wars of revenge among the pre-Confederacy Iroquois tribes. The Peacemaker told Hiawatha of a way to end these wars by creating an alliance among these peoples. This vision, of which the Edge of the Woods and Condolence ceremonies were a major part, became the founding vision of the Iroquois Confederacy and one of the most powerful indigenous alliances in North America. To welcome a group of people into the village at the 'Edge of the Woods' was, in the inner life of most indigenous Americans, a highly charged performance of welcome into safety from unpredictable dangers and challenges. This established relations that were necessary, in the indigenous view, before an exchange of goods could occur. Several Indian groups stopped performing this ceremony for some Europeans because they did not understand or appreciate what was happening and the energy was, in essence, wasted on them. Europeans saw an exchange of goods as a business deal, in the indigenous view trade was a type of interpersonal relationship.³⁴ But by the mid-eighteenth century, it was just as likely for Europeans and Euro-American colonists to have adopted the Condolence ceremony to their own ends. This consisted primarily of efforts at treaty ceremonies to win Indian trust for purposes of maintaining the peace while plans to acquire the Indians' lands and trade goods such as furs went forward.³⁵ To the indigenous Americans, these performances were acknowledgements of crossing a threshold or liminality, between the quotidian of village life and the woods; a realm of great unpredictability. After all, the forest was where Hiawatha had encountered Deganawidah, who had given him – and the Iroquois – the Condolence ceremony.³⁶ Ever pragmatic, for the Iroquois the ceremony was a way of bonding the nations together to prevent warfare. Theatre and performance scholar Victor Turner noted that performances were a way for different peoples to understand one another, a statement supported by the formation of the Iroquois Confederacy through the Condolence ceremonial performance.³⁷ On the other hand, the evidence shows that for English officials and the colonists, it became a way to appease Indian negotiators into letting their guard down, as will be shown.

The acknowledgment of the agency of various forces, human and other-than-human, the establishment of cordial relations through a welcoming performance,

and the immediacy of their religion and history all accentuate the cultural gulf between the indigenous and the colonial. Deganawidah came from the woodlands of North America – where the unseen world is often encountered; Jesus came from the Mediterranean world 1700 years previously. Indigenous history was contained in *wampum* belts and stories told around the fire on long winter nights; the colonial world view turned to previous imperial expansion in both England and the Mediterranean as rationale for the current expansion.

The 'Love of Liberty' depicted in Alfred and claimed as an ancient sentiment of the British remained unacknowledged by colonists when similar sentiments were felt by indigenous peoples whose liberties were greatly compromised by imperial interests. Such acknowledgement would not have served the ends of the Empire, and by the mid-eighteenth century the French and Indians existed in the role of the heathen Danes that Alfred had conquered at Ashdune. The Tory writer Henry St John, Viscount Bolingbroke had written earlier in the century that 'the ancient Britons are to us the aborigines of our island,' but to depict indigenous Americans as possessing the same inclinations as Britons would have brought into question imperial aspirations such as the British manoeuvring for the Ohio Valley that resulted in the French-Indian War.³⁸ The combination of these terms – Glory, Commerce, Liberty – worked to mythologize the perceived superiority of the Britons and their notions of singularly possessing 'Liberty'. Performed by the graduating class at one of the pre-eminent colleges in the North American colonies, the intellectual gatekeepers were clearly possessed of these mythic notions. Indeed, a mere six years prior to this performance, agents of the British Empire had begun pursuing commerce and 'glory' over the Allegheny Mountains in the form of a land speculation enterprise sanctioned by both the Virginia Governor and the King of England.

This enterprise was called the Ohio Company of Virginia. The target of this joint-stock venture was one-half million acres of land along the 'Beautiful River' as it was known to the French and Indians, ('Ohio' being the Iroquois word for 'beautiful,' pronounced 'O-hee-oh' in its original language). To the Ohio Company it was a highway to 'Commerce and Glory'. This company, over its nearly fifty-year lifespan, was a significant vehicle of empire, and its activities on the North American frontier both created and codified techniques for acquiring Indian lands, ostensibly without the taint of blatant ethnic cleansing. The Indians were not considered as having ownership of the lands, but of occupancy, which was something much easier to contend with in the imperial views of legality. A view into how the Ohio Company operated through the ceremonial offices of the treaty councils reveals the difference between what the Ohio Company Commissioners led the Indians to believe, and what their goals really were.³⁹ The fact that these councils were of a performative nature stretches the definition of performance employed here to include treaty ceremonies, which took place

within the context of a Condolence ceremony. But it also stretches the concept in the sense of 'performance' as the employment of deceit to varying degrees.

A common type of 'performance' on the frontier, these treaty talks usually began with an exchange of goods; *wampum* belts were frequently used. Speech was highly formalized, and certain phrases and metaphors were expected; indeed, Indians especially spoke almost exclusively in a metaphorical language during these meetings. Sometimes negotiations resulted in the transfer of lands, although the different parties involved may have different perceptions of what had happened at these events, and there were often concerned parties who were not present. In the 1750s, the 'performances' of the Ohio Company were far more elaborate with more immediate repercussions for those trying to hold onto their lands west of the Appalachian Mountains than the 1757 student performances in Philadelphia. As elaborately staged events that were part and parcel of the political culture of the frontier in this time period, these treaty conferences represent, and were integral to, the performances of 'the country between,' or 'middle ground' between the indigenous and colonial.⁴⁰

In the late 1740s, grants had been obtained from the Governor and Council of Virginia by various investors for up to 1,450,000 acres of land west of that colony, much of it in the Ohio River valley.⁴¹ The Indians had not sold the land at this point (1745–7), although the pretext for the grant's legitimacy was the Treaty of Lancaster of 1744. The performative significance of these treaty meetings as indigenous peoples saw them is largely lost in the historiography of a market society that sees *transaction* above all else because that is what is most valued. In the indigenous world view it is *relationships* that are the cultural centre; relationships of humans to each other and of humans to other-than-human forces. This is why the both the French and British adopted a performance of the Condolence Ceremony to open treaty negotiations: it was requisite to establishing an inter-group *relationship* with the indigenous Americans they had encountered. The historiography of treaty negotiations focuses on the transactions; this analysis is more focused on the underlying relationships that evolved during what might be called 'intercultural performed negotiations', an expression that attenuates the cultural differences between these groups neglected in the historiography.⁴²

The intercultural performed negotiation of the Treaty of Lancaster went a long way towards defining Anglo-Indian relations during the latter part of the eighteenth-century wars of empire that culminated in the American Revolution. Parties participating in the event included Virginia, Maryland and Pennsylvania colonial officials and representatives from the Six Nations of the Iroquois Confederacy. Refugees displaced from the east as well as groups native to the Ohio country including the Miami, Wea, Piankashaw and Mingos were also represented. These were collectively referred to as the 'Ohio Indians' or the 'Ohio

Country Indians'. The Shawnee and Delaware were the largest refugee groups, having migrated from first the Delaware then the Susquehanna watersheds.

The Condolence was performed, creating the highly charged space of relations-building and transacting. Gifts were given, promises were made and the treaty was signed by numerous Indian and British leaders. To the Indians, it was a relation-building exercise. But what they agreed to was rather vague: a 'Renunciation of all their Claim or pretence of Right whatsoever of the said six nations and an acknowledgement of the Right of our Sovereign the King of Great Britain to all the Land in the said Colony of Virginia.' To the Indians this meant the eastern ridge of the Alleghenies and the Potomac River. The British claimed, unbeknownst to the Indians, that the lands of Virginia extended not only into the Ohio valley but all the way to the Mississippi River.⁴³ When the Indians put their marks on the Treaty of Lancaster, they granted or sold no lands, but they unknowingly allowed the Ohio Company investors to put the colour of legality on their scheme to speculate on the Ohio valley lands. In exchange, the Indians were paid four hundred pounds in Pennsylvania money, partially paid in gold and partially in gifts to be delivered later. The treaty goes on to reiterate that the Six Nations also 'recognize and acknowledge the Right and Title of our Sovereign the King of Great Britain to all the land within the said Colony as is now or hereafter may be peopled and bounded by his said Majesty our Sovereign Lord the King his Heirs and Successors.'⁴⁴ The Indians and the British had very different ideas about what those words meant. From the indigenous perspective, they were appeasing the force of the British Empire, through the performance of the Condolence ceremony and formal treaty talks. By accepting the gifts, as they saw it, they obligated themselves to the British *vis-a-vis* the French (1744 was also the beginning of King George's War, or War of the Spanish Succession as it was known in Europe). Meanwhile, they would continue to hunt in the Ohio valley and elsewhere outside of *their* perception of Virginia, a colony whose western boundary abutted the first ridge of the Allegheny Mountains. This intercultural performance event on the frontier, instead of establishing cordial relations between the various groups, put the British Empire, the Ohio Company and their clients on a collision course with the Six Nations and Ohio Country Indians. The subsequent actions of certain parties on the British colonial side of the performance show that this was intentional.

The British laid claim to much of eastern North America south of Canada by the employment of several legal theories of ownership, all founded in Europe. First, lands determined to be 'uninhabited or derelict lands', such as Newfoundland, which was actually inhabited by the Beothuks, were taken under the British flag. Second, charters were given to individuals and corporations by the Crown, but they were required to obtain possession peacefully from 'the original inhabitants or Indian princes.' Third, the right of conquest was considered

grounds for possession by the Crown. The Crown conquest of the Dutch in the Hudson River country gave them, by their reckoning, the right to New Netherlands which was settled by the Treaties of Breda and Westminster in 1677–8.⁴⁵ In order for the Crown to hold the right of conquest as grounds for establishing property rights and ownership by European standards, they had to recognize the Iroquois land possessions by conquest from New York to Virginia and west to the Ohio country.

There was no compelling reason for the Six Nations or the Ohio Indians to surrender their vast lands in that part of the world; certainly not for the small sum of money they had been given, which was of limited value to the Indians. One of the early treaties with the Six Nations had been the Treaty of Albany in 1722, which established the western boundary of Virginia, or rather, the eastern boundary of the Six Nations at the base of the mountains. Indeed, the Six Nation's emissary at Albany stressed numerous times that they had honoured the boundary which seemed universally agreed upon at the Potomac River and the Allegheny ridge.⁴⁶ So while the Treaty of Albany established the boundary between Virginia and the Six Nations at the Potomac and the Alleghenies extending to the south of that river's source, the British tried to claim that the Treaty of Lancaster had extended that boundary to the west. Presumably the British would determine what point that boundary was, and there were those who argued that Virginia's charter extended to the Pacific Ocean.

The Treaty of Lancaster occurred before the Ohio Company was formed. Concern over French presence south of the Great Lakes motivated British colonial interests to maintain their relations with traditional allies like the Six Nations. But the Ohio Indians were increasingly in the imperial crosshairs and the various land grants given to Ohio Company investors, which included Virginia Governor Robert Dinwiddie, meant that boundaries needed to be expanded and Indians placated. Hopefully, from the British colonial view, the Ohio country Indians could be turned against the French. There was an acknowledgement of the Six Nations' function in the perspective of British expansionists in the printed version of the Treaty of Lancaster which is absent from the actual treaty minutes. In an address given by the Pennsylvania Governor to the treaty emissaries at Philadelphia before the actual meeting with the Six Nations, he states that the Indians' status as a buffer between the French and their allies is their value to the British, and that to weaken them in war 'will be, in effect, an attack on yourselves.' The Indians must be appeased, he stated, because if the British did not win their favour the French would. The Indians of course knew their significance in the struggle between the two European empires, but the colonial Governor did not wish this to be openly stated at the Lancaster meeting and the emissaries agreed that it would not be.⁴⁷

By 1750, many Euro-Americans and Europeans had settled west of the Blue Ridge as well as in the Ohio Country, particularly south of the river, in apparent violation of the 1722 Treaty of Albany. The desire to add the colour of law to these as well as the Ohio Company's settlements seems to have been the primary goal of both the Treaty of Lancaster and the subsequent Treaty of Logstown. Viewed with the hindsight of history, the Lancaster Treaty was, on its face, the opening gambit in a ploy to undercut Indian occupation of lands in the Ohio country. Knowing what is known now, the following statement by the Virginia emissary at Lancaster is revealing and, importantly, underscores the performative character of treaty ceremonies (spelling and usage in original):

Friends and Brethern, Sachims, or Chiefs of the Indians of the Six Nations: THESE, your Brethern of *Virginia* and *Maryland*, are come to enlarge the Fire, which was almost gone out, and to make it burn clearer; to brighten the Chain which had contracted some Rust, and to renew their Friendship with you; which it is their Desire may last so long as the Sun, the Moon and the Stars, shall give Light. Their Powers are derived from the *Great King of ENGLAND*, your Father; and whatever Conclusions they shall come to with you, will be as firm and binding as if the Governors of these Provinces were themselves here. I am your Brother, and, which is more, I am your true Friend. As you know, from Experience, that I am so, I will now give you a few Words of Advice. Receive these your Brethern with open Arms; unite yourselves to them in the Covenant Chain, and be you with them as one Body, and one Soul.⁴⁸

The deceit inherent in such statements has long been established. The degree to which such deception is institutionalized in the colonial mindset is less widely recorded. That this sort of deception was (and remains) a fundamental part of centralized power structures is the point of this analysis.

The 'Covenant Chain' was an agreement between the Iroquois Confederacy and various colonial governments going back to the seventeenth century. Both the Virginia Governor and the Governor of Maryland used the metaphor, 'so long as the Sun, the Moon and the Stars shall give Light,' and state that they are the Indians' 'true friends'. The Indians had every reason to make peace with the British, but this was, in retrospect, an attempt to lull the Indians into letting their guard down, which would give whites an opportunity to further encroach onto their lands, leading to further talks and land concessions. In addition, the 'true friends' rhetoric, contrasted with references to the 'evil French', was designed to ally the Six Nations and Ohio Indians with the British. The land cessions thus obtained, it was hoped, would eventually contribute to the 'Commerce and Glory' of the stockholders of the Ohio Company. While the Six Nations and Ohio Indians were well aware of Anglo designs against the French, the performance of the treaty ceremony was the set-up for a larger plan of land appropriation.

As part of 'enlarging the fire' and burnishing the covenant chain 'which had contracted some Rust', the Governor of Maryland complained that the Six Nations were claiming lands that they had given up over a century ago. He also complained that the Indians had 'terrorized' the residents of Maryland with their land claims and complaints to 'Onas' (the Iroquois name for the Pennsylvania governor dating back to William Penn), and that the meeting at Lancaster was called to resolve these 'rash expressions' of the Six Nations. Following the intercultural performance format of the meeting, these claims by the Governor's were divided into three parts, each of which was followed by a gift of *wampum* – a token of good will, which was accepted by the Indians with their customary 'Yo-hah!', also a standard part of the performance.

Following the same formal rhetorical structure, the Six Nations' spokesman, Canassatego, said that because the Governor of Maryland had gone back to the 'old times' the Indians would have to go into council and reply to them the next day. When the performance resumed at that time, Canassatego indicated that what the Marylanders perceived as 'rash expressions' were simply the Six Nations' way of getting them back to the council fire where the covenant chain could be 'made to shine again'. In that regard, he said, it had been a success. As for Maryland's claims to the land going back over one hundred years, Canassatego argued that their ancestors had sprung from the land itself and compared to that, one hundred years was a very short time. Canassatego then proceeded to give the council a history lesson going back to the arrival of the Dutch. In rich metaphorical language, he described each progressive development in their relations with Europeans. Each time another tribe of the Iroquois Confederacy was brought into those relations, he used another metaphor. At first, he said, the Dutch tied their ships to the bushes, but that was not strong enough so the Six Nations tied their ships to the trees. When the trees grew too weak, they tied the Dutch ship to a giant rock; and when this was inadequate, they tied it to a mountain. When the English arrived, they (the Iroquois Confederacy), realized that the rope was only made of *wampum* and would rot, therefore a strong chain of silver supplied by the English replaced the rope and relations had been good.

In the minor disagreements that arose over the years, the English would occasionally try to assert that the Iroquois would have perished had they not had English hatchets and guns. This, Canassatego argued, was not true. They had lived as well or better before the English came, using stone knives and bows and arrows. Now, he said, they are more likely to feel the sting of poverty and the want of deer since they had come to rely on English products, and 'particularly from that Pen-and-Ink Work going on at the Table (pointing to the Secretary)'. For example, he spoke of the time Onas had come to Albany to buy land from the Confederacy, but the Governor of New York, who did not have good relations with Onas, advised against it. Onas, he had said, will do you injustice and he was not to be

trusted. The Iroquois had trusted the Governor of New York to take care of their lands and protect them from Onas and others who might want it. But then the Governor of New York had travelled to England and sold the Susquehanna lands to Onas for a large sum of money, thus betraying the Confederacy. Yet, Canasatego added, sometime later, when it was explained to Onas that the land he had purchased from New York was ill-gotten and a betrayal by New York, Onas generously paid them again for the lands. But, he said, these lands were not the lands of which he spoke today. Those had been lands in the Susquehanna and Wyoming valleys which the British had acknowledged belonged to the Iroquois by right of conquest over the Susquehanna, Shawnee and Delaware. The lands currently in question were lands recently settled upon by whites but had not been purchased from the Indians. Canasatego then assured Maryland of the Six Nations' willingness to negotiate a settlement and presented a belt of *wampum*. As for which lands were claimed by the individual colonies of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia, the Six Nations could not say. It was up to the 'Honour and Justice' of the individual colonies to work it out.⁴⁹

The Ohio Company, formed in the aftermath of the Treaty of Lancaster and King George's War, took as its mission the speculation into these one-half million acres that was dubiously granted them by a government that did not, in the eyes of the indigenous peoples who lived there, own them. However, in order for this mission to be achieved, follow-through was needed on the programme of deception launched against the Indians by the Treaty of Lancaster. To that end, the Company sent Christopher Gist to the region in 1750 to search for 'a large Quantity of good, level Land, such as you think will suit the Company.' He was to measure said lands to the falls of the Ohio (the vicinity of the future Louisville, Kentucky), to keep a journal, and take measurements of the best lands.⁵⁰ The initial charter of the Company included George Washington's half-brothers Lawrence and Augustine, and Washington himself became a member eventually. John Hanbury was the company's connection to the London metropole, and would serve as a connection to the Court as well as a supplier of British goods with which to ply the Indians. King's Council members Thomas Nelson and Thomas Lee (the latter was also a Virginia judge) were included in the original twenty members of the joint-stock company.⁵¹ This high-powered and well-connected organization was not only in competition with the Indians and French for the Ohio country, but with interested officials from Pennsylvania and New York as well.

Christopher Gist made two journeys to the Ohio country on behalf of the Ohio Company between 1750 and 1752. The first was to reconnoitre the land, the second was to set up a meeting at Logstown in the spring of 1752. Gist not only had to keep his mission secret from the Indians, but he had to convince them that he had their interests at heart. Gist's compass was a physical manifestation of

the deception. He wrote in his journal while at Shanopin Town (near the forks of the Ohio River north-east of modern-day Pittsburgh), 'I took an Opportunity to set my Compass privately, & took the Distance across the River, for I understood it was dangerous to let a Compass be seen among these Indians.'⁵² It was important that Gist not be found out. If he was discovered, it was not only likely that the Ohio Indians as well as the Six Nations kill Gist. They would also set their faces against the English and turn toward the French. He found allies amongst his Anglo competitors, namely George Croghan, a trader and representative of Pennsylvania and that colony's official representative among the western Indians, as well as the Canadian mixed-blood Andrew Montour who acted as interpreter for Pennsylvania. It was Croghan who convinced suspicious Indians that Gist's purpose among them was to set up a rendezvous where gifts from the King of England would be given to them. This was only partially true, for the treaty ceremony that Gist would eventually set up at Logstown on the upper Ohio was for the purpose of obtaining lands in the Ohio Valley. Gifts to be distributed at Logstown, although sanctioned by the King, came from the coffers of the Ohio Company who used the imprimatur of King George to give their enterprise validity in the eyes of the natives. But the affair was, after all, an Ohio Company operation, sanctioned by Virginia Governor Robert Dinwiddie (a stockholder), although the Company's petition to engage in land speculation near the Forks of the Ohio had been recognized by the Board of Trade and thus the Crown.⁵³ Thomas Penn, the Proprietor of Pennsylvania Colony, had an eye on these developments as well, having written to his secretary in January of 1749 regarding Colonel Lee's 'Indian Trade Schemes'.⁵⁴ Land speculation projects were the primary impetus for expansion, treaty ceremonies were a primary method of expansion.

Ohio Company Secretary George Mason gave formal instructions to Christopher Gist just before he set out for the Logstown treaty ceremonies in April of 1752. These instructions, in short, envisioned a scenario where the Six Nations, Shawnee, Delaware, and other Ohio valley Indians would find themselves living on land belonging to the King of Britain. This was considered by the British, or at least the Ohio Company, to be the case from the colonially disputed territory of western Pennsylvania, to the east and south of the Ohio River to the Great Canaway River. Said by the Ohio Company (as well as historians writing about these events) to be attributable to the Treaty of Lancaster, nowhere in that treaty does it say this. Historian Alfred James acknowledged, however, that the situation was ambiguous. He states that the confirmation of the Lancaster 'deed' of 1744 was confirmed on 13 June 1752, not at Logstown but at Shannopin's Town. This was reportedly done in a private conference with the Indians and interpreter Andrew Montour. These private negotiations, even if they resulted in the 'deed' that the Ohio Company claimed, give rise to the question of the Six Nations' ability and right to deal lands inhabited by the Ohio Indians. This

was the importance of the British acknowledging the Iroquois right of conquest. James notes that, 'The diplomatic and legal aspects of the dependency of the Ohio Valley Indians upon the Six nations Indians presented a difficulty, one familiar to American colonial historians.'⁵⁵ This 'difficulty' was the ambiguous legality of the European claim to lands in North America.

The culmination of Gist's foray into the Ohio Country came with the ceremonial treaty performance at Logstown in June of 1752. The Virginians initially paid little attention to the Indians' ceremonial protocol for the staging of the diplomatic talks. This in spite of the fact that Gist had spent the previous winter travelling through the region inviting the Indians to this meeting at the last full moon of the spring. No messengers had been sent telling the Indians of their coming, but the female Seneca leader Aliquippa provided an 'Edge of the Woods' ceremony to welcome the commissioners when they delivered the promised goods to her town. The commissioners first arrived at Shanopin Town, where they ceremonially thanked the Indians for the *wampum* that had been delivered in advance. They then warned of rumours began by 'wicked persons' and extended to 'our Brethren, who live towards the sun Setting,' a reference to the Ohio Indians, an offer to advise them on their affairs, for which purpose the Logstown assembly was intended.⁵⁶

At Logstown, the Condolence was performed in the usual manner, and relations between the Six Nations and the Virginians seemed amicable enough, although the Six Nations representatives wanted to wait until their liaison from Onondaga arrived before they made a statement beyond the opening formalities. But when it was time for the Ohio Indians to speak, the tone may have been similar but the *wampum* was not. It began with an address of Condolence by two Shawnees representing one of the largest Indian groups in the Ohio Country. Big Hominy first, then Tamany Buck, as they were known to the whites, spoke:

Brethren. You have come a long and blind way if we had been certain which way you were coming we should have met you at some distance from the town, but we now bid you welcome and we open your eyes with this string of wampum which we give you in the name of the six united nations. *Gave a string* [of wampum].

Brethren of Virginia and Pensylvania [*sic*], I desire you will hearken to what I am going to say that you may open your hearts and speak freely to us, we don't doubt but you have many things in your minds which may trouble you notwithstanding which we hope we may continue in friendship on which we give you these strings of wampum. *Gave two strings*.⁵⁷

It is hard to tell from these opening statements that the two Shawnees were on the verge of walking out of the talks. But the *wampum* strings presented by the Shawnee and Delaware speakers contained black *wampum* beads as a warning

to the English. Having been driven from the Delaware valley to the west of the mountains had hardened them to any British 'advice' that might ensue.

The Six Nations, on the other hand, were still in a relative position of power and were less threatened by the Virginians. When the liaison Tanaghrisson, or the 'Half-King' as he was called by the English, arrived on a boat flying English colours on the Allegheny River. After taking his place in the council, he had much to say on behalf of the Six Nations to all parties gathered. The similarities and differences between the Half-King's formal speech in 1752 and Conassatego's in 1744 are notable, as are the performative qualities of the treaty ceremony. Tanaghrisson performed the Six Nations' perceived power over the Ohio Indians, notably the Shawnee and Delaware, ordering them to 'go to war no more' against their white brethren. He also reminded the interpreter Andrew Montour that he was a part of the Six Nations and that he was regarded as one of the chief counsellors and should take that trust to heart in his interpreting. The Half-King also admonished the traders associated with Onas, the Pennsylvania Governor, for continuing to bring kegs of rum into the Indians' territory after the Six Nations had asked them to restrict its distribution. Since one of the traders in question, Conrad Weiser, had 'spoken with his mouth and not with his heart', Tanaghrisson returned the *wampum* belt that was given to them at that previous meeting.⁵⁸ Obviously speaking with diplomatic sensitivity, he then addressed the issue of Virginia's claims to Six Nations' land as per the Ohio Company officials' interpretation of the Treaty of Lancaster:

We are glad you have acquainted us with the Right to those Lands, & we assure you we are willing to confirm any Thing our Council has done in Regard to the Land, but we never understood, before you told us Yesterday, that the Lands then sold were to extend further to the Sun setting than the Hill on the other Side of the Allegany Hill, so that we can't give you a further Answer now.

The Half-King went on to concur with the Anglos earlier statements regarding the French lust for their lands; ironically so given that the French were much less land hungry than the British. However, the French had recently attacked the Twightwees (Miamis), who were allies of the Six Nations and to a lesser extent the British, thus exacerbating already hostile relations.⁵⁹ But Tanaghrisson and the Six Nations wanted a British trading post at the forks of the Ohio even though there had been trouble between the Indians and some of the traders:

[T]here has been Reason for many Complaints for some Time past, but we will not complain of our Brethren. the Traders, for we love them, & can't live without them, but we hope you will take care to send none among us but good Men, sure you know them that are fit, & we hope you will advise them how to behave, & we will take all the Care we can of our young Men, that they shall behave better than they have done.⁶⁰

Acknowledging that the Indians 'can't live without' the traders in this performance of Tanaghrisson is a shift from Canassatego's 1744 declaration that dependence on British goods had made the Six Nations more impoverished than before the Europeans had arrived.

Earlier, the English had broached the subject of the Indians and colonists living side-by-side in harmony:

Brethren, it is the Design of the King, our Father, at present, to make a Settlement of British Subjects on the South East Side of Ohio, that we may be united as one People, by the strongest Ties of Neighbourhood as well as Friendship, & by these Means be able to withstand the Insults of our Enemies, be they of what Kind soever.

From such a Settlement greater Advantages will arise to you, than you can at present conceive, our People will be able to supply you with Goods much Cheaper than can at this Time be afforded; they will be a ready Help in Case you should be attacked, and some good Men among them will be appointed, with Authority to punish & restrain the many Injuries & Abuses too frequently committed here, by disorderly white People.

Brethren, be assur'd that the King, our Father, by purchasing your Lands, had never any Intention of taking them from you, but that we might live together as one People, & keep them from the French, who would be bad Neighbours.⁶¹

The irony in this statement is that the French were much less likely to be interested in usurping the Indians' lands. These commissioners were from Virginia and many of them were investors in the Ohio Company; a company that had usurping the Indians' lands uppermost in mind. The commissioners stated that if the Indians wanted a trading post, which they did, they would have to free up land for white settlers to live in the area to supply the post with food and other supplies from the woods. Tanaghrisson told them in a private meeting, in essence, that honest traders were welcome, a well-built trading post was welcome, a blacksmith was welcome, but settlers were not.⁶²

The Virginians had also reiterated the claim to Indian lands by virtue of the 'deed' in the Treaty of Lancaster. On this point the Half-King replied:

Brother, we have heard what you said in Regard to the King's Design of making a Settlement of his People on the Waters of the River Ohio; you likewise told us you had a Deed for those Lands signed by our Council at the Treaty of Lancaster; we assure you of our Willingness to agree to what our Council does or has done, but we have not the full Power in our Hands here on Ohio.

We must acquaint our Council at Onondago of the Affair, and whatsoever they bid us do, we will do.

Andrew Montour did indeed confer with the Half-King and other dignitaries in private on 13 June, but after the Logstown treaty was signed by the Indians, Half-King repeated that regarding settlements, no agreement could be made until there was a council among the Six Nations at Onondaga. The Ohio Com-

pany's officials and its subsequent historians overlooked this point.⁶³ This point would be addressed the following year at a treaty ceremony in Winchester, Virginia where these Onondaga leaders to whom the Half-King referred were in attendance.

In the interim, arrangements were made for a meeting with the main Six Nations council at Winchester. The conference opened with a performance of the Condolence ceremony on 11 September 1753, with Monacatootha representing the Six Nations and Andrew Montour translating for the Virginia leadership. Present were the members of the Onondaga Council, and they strongly denied any cession of land in the Ohio country. Monacatootha couched this message in a relatively diplomatic tone. He stated that the Six Nations felt neither the French nor the British were entitled to occupy the upper Ohio region. The Iroquois statesmen also denied the rights of settlement by European immigrants and the construction of 'strong houses', essential storehouses or forts, in that country.⁶⁴ This, along with the return of the Miami Indians to the French and the construction of French forts between Lake Erie and the Ohio River, did not bode well for the imperial project of the Ohio Company, or for the broader aims of His Britannic Majesty's colonial designs. The Ohio Company had clearly overstepped its bounds with the Six Nations and the Ohio Indians, claiming a patent to land unsecured by treaty. The attempt to circumvent the ritual performances of the indigenous culture, where the mutual obligations of the gift economy and honest dealing were the expectation, had failed – at least for the time being. The English colonists' performances in this 'middle ground' were duplicitous. If not for the military force of the British army, the frontier dynamic would have been significantly changed.

This is not surprising, given the history of European Empire in the New World before and after this event. From religious justifications for 'ethnic cleansing' to duplicitous dealings with the Indians in treaty affairs, historians have studied these phenomena although their connection to the present has yet to be codified into the everyday reality of the twenty-first century. Many indigenous peoples throughout the world in the intervening centuries could identify with the Shawnee who cried, 'You have cheated us, is this the way you are going to treat us always while you remain in this country?' or the Delaware chief who said at a treaty ceremony, 'This very ground that is under me was my Land and Inheritance, and is taken from me by fraud.'⁶⁵ This is not a revelation to historians of empire. But the degree to which performance has played a role in this expropriation of land is important for a *long durée* understanding of empire.

That the Six Nations and the Ohio Indians were aware of this was becoming apparent by the time of the Albany Congress of 1754. This gathering was both a conference of officials from Maryland to New Hampshire to discuss unifying the governance of these colonies and a meeting with representatives of the Six Nations.

The overriding concern was the expansion of the French Empire since the Treaty of Aix-La-Chapelle ending King George's War in 1848. The French, concerned about British designs on the Ohio Country and the Six Nations' land, had begun building forts south of the Great Lakes and, after Logstown, had even struck against the Miami town of Pickawillany that had welcomed British traders.⁶⁶ An expedition led by the French officer Celeron de Bienville ventured down the Ohio River burying lead plates at the mouths of major tributaries and re-establishing relations with the Indians.⁶⁷ The Board of Trade wrote to the New York colonial administration in September of 1753 to redouble their efforts to maintain good relations with the Iroquois Confederacy, which had declined in that colony in recent years. The Board expressed concern that the Mohawks had walked out of talks the previous year at Fort George and that the administration had been inattentive in correcting this disturbance. Fix them in the British interest, was the order from London. Provide individuals to meet with them whom they trust and do so immediately. Bury the hatchet and tell them of the King's gifts that were to arrive directly. Examine the defrauding of their lands and redress their complaints, make no grants of land not authorized by the Crown, and prohibit private citizens from making land deals with Indian leaders. Finally, the Board recommended that all provinces be included in a single treaty made in the King's name to universalize Indian policy throughout the North American colonies.⁶⁸

The approach of the Albany commissioners in responding to these orders demonstrates the political situation of the colonial officials caught between capricious traders and land speculators and imperial officials looking out for the long-term interests of the British Empire. In response to these demands from London, commissioners in Albany wrote a speech delivered to the Six Nations' representatives at the formal treaty talks commencing during the Albany Congress that summer. After the usual 'Condolence' performance, the commissioners encouraged the Indians to live in single 'castles,' as the whites termed the Iroquois 'longhouses' or traditional multi-family dwellings. Concerned about the Senecas, who were furthest west of the Iroquois League members and most likely to join with the French, they recommended building two forts, one near the central village of Onondaga and one among the Senecas; both to include a missionary. No French traders were to be tolerated if discovered among the Six Nations, as they had 'always been of fatal consequence.'⁶⁹

The Mohawk representatives arrived late, on 27 June, and subsequently addressed the issue of land encroachment. After the opening performance and the exchange of *wampum* belts, the Mohawk spokesman, Canadagara, said, 'We understand that there are writings [deeds] for all our lands, so that we shall have none left but the very spot we now live upon and hardly that'. The elderly recalled no such deal for their lands, he added, and some of the English have taken more land than they were given and at least one town had been constructed on lands

not sold to the English. As a result, the game was depleted or had fled the area and the Mohawks were impoverished.⁷⁰

The next day the Mohawks from the 'upper castle', or Conajohary, took their turn in the treaty ceremony. After the Indian Hendrick and the Governor performed an abbreviated version of the 'Condolence' ceremony, the Mohawk leader got down to business. They had been slow in attending the ceremonial meeting because when they had come the previous year, they had been ignored and they thought the Covenant Chain was broken. This was one of the events about which the Board of Trade had expressed concern. The neglect of the British, Hendrick continued, would drive the Iroquois to the French who were already making overtures to them at Oswegachie and in the Ohio country. Hendrick reiterated this a few days later, emphasizing the point by throwing a stick behind his back to illustrate how the English had treated the Mohawk in recent years. He went on to point out that the Governor of Virginia and the Governor of Canada were quarrelling over lands that belonged to the Six Nations.⁷¹ Both had built roads and houses without asking permission. The Ohio Company was financing the immigration of people into lands at the Ohio and Potomac River tributaries which Shanaghrisson had stated quite clearly were not released for white settlement. The Ohio Company and imperial officials had stated just as emphatically that this was included in the Treaty of Lancaster but, as has been shown, a close reading of that treaty reveals no such statement on the part of the Indians. Obviously, the Ohio Company was, at best, projecting their wishful thinking onto the ceremonial treaty performance. It is more likely that they did not take the Indians' perspective into account, and were trying to maximize their profits as quickly as possible. Crown officials, especially the military who would have to contend with the consequences, would ultimately be at loggerheads with the land speculators.

In New York, traders were less organized but were making land deals and coaxing the Indians into incurring debt, often with rum as the bait, giving the traders the upper hand. During the treaty 'performance', Hendrick, the Half-King and other indigenous leaders consistently complained of the sale of rum and asked it to be banished from the trading posts. It was this independent action that the letter from the Board of Trade addressed, and was also the chief complaint being lodged by both Tanaghrisson at Logstown and Hendrick at Albany. Hendrick informed the Albany commissioners that money, powder, lead, and guns acquired by Indians selling furs to Albany traders were going, via Oswego, to the Ohio country and into the hands of the 'French Indians'. The blindness of the local traders, induced by profits, kept them from seeing or even perhaps caring about this. Hendrick warned that the French could threaten Albany militarily in short order and that the Six Nations were instrumental in preventing this calamity.⁷² In short, both London and the Six Nations' leadership saw the colonial

traders and speculators as a threat to their interests, but stopped short of doing away with them altogether. By casting away their old tool kits for manufactured goods, the Six Nations had made themselves dependent upon European tools, cloth and other items, of which those of British origin tended to be superior to the French. The British Empire needed both the Indians on their side against the French, but wanted to make inroads, albeit slowly and orderly, west of the mountains. The performances of the officials at treaty conferences show how these inroads were often made, and why the Empire was both burdened by and dependent upon traders and land speculators to make them.

As for the Ohio Company, they spent much of this period suing their clients. The Company had advanced land and supplies to them, and when they could not pay, they were taken to court. As much energy was put into this endeavour as was put into their actual expansion into the Ohio country.⁷³ Acquiring profit, to be made from combining land taken by deceit from the Indians via frontier performances, with the immigrants' desire for land of their own, had set the whole project in motion. When a German colonial promoter asked the Company what encouragement they would give to German Protestant immigrants to settle on 'their' lands rather than in Pennsylvania, Ohio Company officials responded: 'A large Accession of foreign Protestants will not only be advantageous to this Colony but the most effectual method of promoting a speedy Settlement on the Ohio, and extending and securing the same', the reply began. The Acts of Toleration guaranteed religious liberties – at least regarding Christians. They would be entitled to Naturalization, giving them English citizenship. The joys of electing a Representative to the Legislature were stressed, as were the English laws of liberty and property which were 'allowed the best in the World for securing the peoples' lives and fortunes against Arbitrary power or any unjust Encroachments whatever'. The responder, most likely the company secretary, George Mason, then described the three levels of taxation: Public, County, and Parish, all payable in tobacco, the 'Staple of the Countrey', although white females and males under sixteen years of age were exempt. But these are among the lowest levies anywhere, it continues, and the local militia obviates the need for paid soldiers. Besides, the Virginia legislature had recently passed an ordinance exempting foreign Protestants from these levies for ten years upon their arrival. The Ohio Company, it was claimed, was entitled to 500,000 acres abutting the Ohio River exempt of Quit Rent for ten years, at which time the said Quit Rent would be no more than two schillings per one hundred acres. Every 'foreign protestant' would be able to secure as much land as they wished for five pounds sterling per hundred acres, free of Quit Rents for the ten years, as stated. Immigrants would be provided with warehouses and carriages, wheat flour, salt at cost with the option of buying these items on two years' credit. Accessible land, more fertile than any east of the mountains, all manner of timber and stone for building,

coal, salt springs, minerals, clear access to the Mississippi River, and Indians who 'for some hundred miles round are not only in Strict Amity and friendship with this Government but have faithfully promised to Assist and protect the English Settlements on the Ohio'.⁷⁴

This letter was written nine days before another letter, written by Governor Dinwiddie and sent to the Ohio Company commissioners, told of the Twightwees (Miamis) going over to the French. It is also significant in the face of these claims being made to potential German immigrants, that Dinwiddie also acknowledged the need to meet with the main leaders of the Six Nations at Onondaga and ply them with powder and arms. In other words, the most powerful (and least expansionist) of the regional powers, the Iroquois Confederacy, had not been treated with in full, but only with their Ohio emissary, the Half-King.⁷⁵

Many of the Ohio country Indians and some of the Six Nations began turning away from the British with an eye toward remaining neutral in the tense atmosphere between Treaty of Aix-La-Chapelle in 1748 and the outbreak of open hostilities between the two empires in 1754. General Braddock's defeat and Colonel Washington's retreat is a well-told story among historians of this period, as is the broader war for the resources and markets of North America that began in the Ohio country.⁷⁶ After the defeat of the French at Fort Duquesne, Niagara, Quebec and Montreal their position in North America was significantly weakened. The official French presence was increasingly limited to outposts such as Detroit, Kaskaskia, Arkansas Post, New Orleans, and on the Missouri River at Fort Cavagnial (near modern-day Kansas City). The catalyst for the war was competition for the Ohio River valley, coveted by the Ohio Company, and claimed by both England and France.

After the French had been driven out of the Ohio country, some colonists were anxious to move into Indian lands and the British administration, especially the military, was sensitive to this potential flashpoint for further trouble on the frontier. The Six Nations had every intention of hanging onto their hunting grounds in the upper Susquehanna region. Numerous colonial projects loomed however, and a treaty ceremony was scheduled at the village of Easton on the Delaware River in 1758. At this event, the Delaware Indians who were living in the Wyoming Valley were represented by Teedyuscung, a long-time resident of the region and self-proclaimed 'King of the Delawares'. At Easton, he made a deal with Pennsylvania Governor James Hamilton, prompted by the British, that he would bring the Ohio Delawares into the British fold in exchange for being allowed to remain in the Wyoming Valley. A deal was also made with the Six Nations to give back lands that had been sold by them at the Albany Treaty ceremony.⁷⁷ There is some question to the legitimacy of the Pennsylvania claim to the upper Susquehanna land sale at that treaty ceremony in 1754. Like the Lancaster Treaty, the actual 'sale' of land at the ceremony was ambiguous. The

minutes say that John Penn, son of William – the original ‘Onas’ – declared the Pennsylvania commissioners ‘were about purchasing from the Six Nations a tract of land within the boundaries of said Government below the latitude of 42° (today the Pennsylvania–New York border); and the Indians also then published their intention of making the said sale at the Commissioners lodgings.’⁷⁸ Given the immediate history and the aftermath of the Albany Treaty, this ‘transaction’ seems ambiguous at best. In any case, the British military and the Crown wanted no trouble from the Indians or the colonists during the French–Indian War. The various land speculation projects initiated in Pennsylvania, New York and Connecticut were put on hold after the Easton treaty ceremony.⁷⁹

As historian Michael McConnell notes, the Easton treaty was a watershed in British imperial policy, in relations between the Indians and the colonists and, ultimately between the British and the colonists. One can discern, in these performances, from the ‘Commerce and Glory’ of Britain’s colonial expansion to the Condolence Ceremony and the intercultural performances joined into by these very different cultural groups, that the ‘colonial’ paradigm had no room for the ‘indigenous’. The only real adjustment the colonial forces made to the indigenous peoples was to adopt the ‘Condolence’ ceremonies to create the appearance of sincerity. The actions of the British and especially their colonists as the French–Indian War wound down convinced many Indians that only military defence of their lands – an insurgency – could restore a measure of security.

This was the geo-political dynamic created by and reflected in the performances on the frontier between these two cultural groups. Native American commitment to their gift economy which focused on creating good relations and fulfilling mutual obligations contrast sharply with colonial performances glorifying the exploitation of the continent in largely mythical terms. Members of colonial society were reminded through theatrical performances, professional and amateur, that the ‘Commerce, Glory and Liberty’ of England were being served by imperial expansion. Indigenous performances were rooted in their relationships with ‘persons’, both human and other-than-human, that could affect the group for good or ill. The temptations of the Europeans’ manufactured goods drew Native Americans into an increasingly dependent relationship with them, which the ceremonial treaty performances reflected. Nevertheless, their performances dedicated to their obligations with other-than-human persons continued with the Green Corn Ceremony and other performances that will be described subsequently. By contrasting these performances with those of the Empire, the true implications of what is meant by ‘colonial’ are revealed in a stark relief that only increases with time.

2 THE CORN MOTHER AND 'RISING GLORY'

During midsummer, crops planted by indigenous Americans of the eastern woodlands began to ripen. Their agriculture was based on a syncretic relationship between the 'Three Sisters': maize, beans and squash. Maize was their chief food source and much of their ceremonial performance life centred on the life cycle of this plant. The Green Corn Festival, or busk – from the Muskogee word *poskita*, meaning 'to fast' – was a 'first fruits' celebration that signalled the appearance of the greens ears that would eventually be harvested in the autumn.¹ It was the beginning of the year for many eastern North American indigenous villagers, and there was a taboo against eating the corn before this event. Three 'meetings' signalled the preparatory stages of the performances. First, clan Chiefs assembled and sent out orders for new pottery vessels for the medicines that would be used. Second, new mats were ordered to provide seats for the assembly; and third, runners were sent out with bundles of sticks for the families involved in the event. The head of the household, typically a woman, would remove one stick from the bundle every day until they were gone, at which time they would all meet at a designated plaza to begin the immediate preparations.

This plaza, which was usually located away from the village, had four buildings constructed of logs and/or wattle and daub along each side. Each building was about five feet tall on the outside with a pitched roof and one door that faced the plaza. Inside were broad benches to be covered with the new grass mats; the posts and beams were painted with various designs that were of some significance to the painter. A thick pole was placed against the inside wall and during the performance these poles were hung with bundles of cane decorated with black and white feathers. The corners of the plaza were open and outside of one was a council house, round with a conical roof and a door often below ground level. Beyond this was another plaza, surrounded by cornfields, in the center of which was a high mound composed of leavings – ashes and soil – from previous 'poskita' ceremonies. The ashes from the actual ceremonial fires were kept outside one of the corners of this second plaza and carefully preserved. People who drank alcohol, women, strangers or anyone who had touched a white man were not permitted within this square.

Prior to the preparation of the grounds, the women's dance was held in the main ceremonial plaza, after which men and women were separated until the end of the fasting period. Then the plaza was prepared, all structures in the village were swept out and washed and all fires extinguished. This was the end of the old year; misdeeds were forgiven, animosities checked, and those who had committed theft or adultery were given amnesty. A new fire was then started by those appointed for the task using the hand drill, bow drill, or flint methods of starting fires. This flame was then put in the centre of the plaza and a larger fire constructed from it. Medicines were prepared in the new vessels and drinking gourds containing a strong emetic made from snakeroot were put on benches, prepared and guarded with great ceremony by those selected to the task.

At this point, people came to the plaza and sat in the four structures with the chiefs standing around the edges of the square. The 'black drink' portion of the ceremony then began, with long, single note refrains being repeated three times. Then the chiefs lined up diagonally across the square with their backs facing opposite corners looking outward from the centre. They each then successively drank the emetic from the gourds and subsequently vomited the drink, all with very little physical motion. The black drink was then passed around to the seated villagers who, of course, had the same reaction as the chiefs. One of the leaders then gave a speech, reminding them of the importance of their ritual life, and laying out the immediate events to follow in the performance. The language used during the performance was a mystical, poetic idiom that was incomprehensible to outsiders, even those who knew the language of every day usage.

Then the dancing began. Men painted white kept time with a gourd rattle while remaining stationary on their individual mats. After a time, all the other men joined in the dance with feather fans, at a certain point simultaneously raising their hands over the fire. The dancing grew in speed and intensity, and ended only when the dancers shouted out a loud 'whoop', at which time they ran down to the river as part of the 'going to water' ritual that accompanied many of these performances.² Returning to the square, other dances were performed related to animals and one that pertained to their popular ball game, today generally known as 'lacrosse'. At the end of the day, the 'scratching ceremony' was performed, with participants moving to the backs of the four buildings on the plaza, having their legs scratched until they bled, and the blood then scraped off and flung onto the buildings. At night, dancing, singing and the ritualized making of medicine with accompanying songs continued until dawn.

On the second day, the black drink ceremony was repeated, and if they were available, great circular shields of copper and brass were brought into the dancing. Some ears of the green corn were brought to one of the chiefs who invoked that power of the corn that it might be plentiful at harvest. A dance sequence followed which John Howard Payne called the 'gun dance'³ A line of women

came singing into the plaza and into one of the houses where they sat across from the men who were shaking gourd rattles in accompaniment. Two men armed with tomahawks then danced around a half circle. The women then covered the mound that was in the middle of the outer plaza and took up their singing again standing on the mound. Stuffed figures were then placed in the corners of the square with the mound. Then two groups of warriors along with the two dancing warriors crept up on these figures. They attacked and 'killed' the figures in a mock battle. After this brief chaos, the warriors began dancing around the mound for a time, then ran to the main plaza where they 'attacked' spectators with cornstalks. They then ran back to the mound square then to the river for the 'going to water' ritual. A feast of the green corn then began and, in the case of Payne's account, considerable drinking followed.

The third day involved a deer hunt, followed by more feasting and dancing long into the night. Jonathan Alder, a white captive who grew up among the Shawnee Indians of Ohio during this period recounted much 'wrestling, canoe racing, jumping, and shooting with bow and arrow and guns' as part of the festivities. Also, specially selected and trained dancers were elaborately painted and, along with musicians (singers and drummers), were a main attraction. They would gather in a certain area and draw a crowd, then one of the musicians would duck down and run through the crowd with the whole group following him in single file to another location where the singing and dancing would start up again. Eventually the musicians and dancers would slip through the crowd, then into a tent where they were washed up and rejoined the crowd as though they had been there all along.⁴

The fourth day began with the women dancing in their finest clothes, in three circles with two women dancing a fourth circle outside the other three, with the men seated outside of the circles. Among the Shawnee prizes were given and an arrow was shot into the water. Whoever retrieved it won the best prize. Several other dances followed and at the end of the fourth day the ceremony ended, renewing the people's connection to the corn and beginning a new year leaving the old behind. This seasonal renewal not only paid tribute to Mother Corn, but 'furnished material for conversation in many a cabin and around many a camp-fire for many days afterwards'.⁵

Other indigenous performances related to the staple of corn included the planting and harvest ceremonies, which were just as elaborate, if not more so, than the Green Corn Ceremony. This performance was not simply a festive event for each village; it was dedicated to the 'other-than-human persons' that were fundamental to the Indians' survival. Without the corn, the Indians would find it very difficult to exist, a fact that was increasingly brought home to them as attacks by whites on their villages increased. The destruction of Indian fields and food caches was a major strategy of whites who sought to drive Indians out of

an area. At such times the Indians would have to rely on the most basic of foods or hope for assistance from their French or English allies. Jonathan Alder told of subsisting on 'pawpaws, mussels and crawfish' when the Shawnees were attacked by whites and driven away from their towns. It was not until 'warriors came to our relief' with a supply of deer and bear that the women and children were able to have a proper meal.⁶

Before the Treaty of Paris was signed in 1763, frontier performances began to reflect the growing discontent of the British victory and occupation of French forts. The French had engaged the indigenous gift economy which was expensive, but which won the allegiance of most Indian groups west and north of the Ohio River. British failure to continue this practice with consistency after the major imperial hostilities hurt their relations with the Indians.⁷ The Delaware Indians had suffered not only by being divided by conflicting allegiances during the recent war, but had been steadily driven by white encroachment from first the Delaware watershed, then the upper Susquehanna watershed. A growing discontent among the Indians with British encroachment into the Trans-Appalachian West manifested in a widespread resistance movement that included elements of a syncretic, millennial revivalism. The Delaware holy man Neolin was instrumental in popularizing this insurgency in the region. Around 1760 he had experienced a vision in which the 'Master of Life' said that the Indians' problems were rooted in their attachment to and dependence on the whites. The vision said that in order to restore the indigenous world the Indians must eliminate their connections to colonial society. Neolin drew a pictograph of the situation: in the lower portion were the Indians, in the upper portion was heaven. Where formerly there was a direct line between the two, the whites, with their manufactured goods and rum, had intervened and pulled the Indians off the path. The old path to 'heaven' was now longer. But the Indians believed they could still restore their prelapsarian world.⁸ New songs and dances accompanied this restoration movement, and they performed these for what missionary James Kenny called 'a little God who carries ye petitions & presents them to ye Great Being, which is too High & mighty to be Spoke to by them; this little God lives in some place near them.'⁹ Kenny's negative comments were directed against his chief competition in the Ohio country and reveals an essential element of the indigenous paradigm. Borrowing A. Irving Hallowell's more apropos term 'other-than-human person' – an entity believed to have agency and representing a force to be appeased – this 'little god' lived in the Indians' world. Among groups about whom we know more, such as the Pawnee peoples discussed in Chapter Six, this 'person' may have been a manifestation of animal, plant or some other force of nature that was experienced in daily life. Because of its familiarity and association with aspects of life that were felt or perceived but were not understood, forces that might be collectively called the Great Mystery, it was logical to appeal

to them. Kenny also mentioned the more general use of eagle feathers and tails in the performances of Neolin and his followers. These songs, dances and ritual performances would last 'for ye space of near two Hours or more, when ye wind Will Raise ready to blow down ye Houses'. It is unclear what phenomena Kenny was referencing in this statement or if it was sarcasm.¹⁰

John McCullough also encountered this cultural revitalization movement when he lived as a captive among the Shawnee and Delaware in the vicinity of the forks of the Ohio River, although he never met Neolin himself. His Indian brother travelled 40 or 50 miles to hear the 'Delaware prophet'. Those who saw him, from McCullough's experience, told that he had a parchment marked with hieroglyphs depicting the human situation on the earth and 'denoting something of a future state'¹¹ of human existence in the next life. These individuals also noted that he was crying and exhorting them to carry the message of cultural and individual purification; emetics such as those used in the Green Corn ceremony could be used. Neolin also called for abstinence from sex and guns and a return to their 'original state that they were in before the white people found their country'. Fire made by steel and flint was taboo, and handshakes should be done with the left hand, which was closest to the heart, a custom McCullough said was an ancient one with them. Those who followed Neolin's teachings lived apart from the rest of the villages, representing a 'separatist' group not unlike the Puritans in England nearly two centuries earlier.¹² McCullough described Neolin's hieroglyph:

They taught that all those on the right hand of the square surface, of the world, went immediately after death to heaven – and part of those on the uppermost square, to the left; those on the lowest square to the left, are those who are abandonedly wicked; they go immediately on the road that leads to hell. The places marked A, B, C, are where the wicked have to undergo a certain degree of punishment, before they are admitted into heaven – and that each of those places are a flame of fire – the place on the right hand line, or road to heaven, marked D, denotes a pure spring of water, where those who have been punished at the aforesaid places stop to quench their thirsts, after they had undergone a purgation by fire. It must be observed, that the places marked A, B, C, differed, (as they taught) in degree of heat, still as the mark, or hieroglyphic decreases in size, It increases about one-third more in heat – the first is not as hot as the second by one-third, nor the second as the third, in the same proportion.¹³

The influence of Christianity on this movement is apparent in the references to heaven, hell and purgatory, as well as the abstinence from sexual relations. Anthropologist Charles Hunter has pointed out that many Christian influences were readily at hand, including Presbyterian missionary David Brainerd, Quaker missionary David Zeisberger and others.¹⁴

In February 1763, Delaware Indian James Mokesin told Kenny that the all of the Delaware intended to follow this new 'Plan of Religion' and all young boys would revert to the bow and arrow. They would live entirely on dried meat and a bitter drink made from roots, and the elderly people could continue to grow corn. After seven years, the Delaware would be entirely independent of the market economy imported by Europeans. A trader from Beaver Creek reported to Kenny that a ritual feast was held by the Delawares where they consumed twenty-four each of bears, deer, turkeys and squirrels. Six head counsellors and six young men were chosen to bring twelve stones to put in the fire. They then burned the fat of the animals on the stones, and then made a sweat lodge of twelve poles. They accentuated the fact that this is the way the Grandfathers worshipped. The participants then sang a hymn of adorations and prayer, followed by dancing and singing.¹⁵

'Shaking Tent' ceremonial performances, common among Algonquian speaking peoples, were included in Neolin's revitalization movement. In these, people would gather around a cabin or tent while a holy man went inside to 'conjure' for a vision. The shaman would call out questions and the cabin would shake while the winds rose within and the unseen, 'other-than-human persons' would provide answers to the questions. A British trader at Detroit, a sceptic himself, reported that he had heard of the 'unseen persons' shaking a tent that 'four men could not budge'.¹⁶ The 'Shaking Tent' has long been part of indigenous performances. Adrian Tanner reported these still being performed among the Cree peoples in the mid-twentieth century.¹⁷ The incorporation of 'other-than-human persons' from the unseen world that must be honoured and appeased was part of the indigenous *Sachem's* divination rites then and now.

This was a grass roots folk revival rooted in an indigenous culture driven to refugee status, strongly influenced by Christianity, but maintaining an intimate connection to the visible and invisible forces of nature. The indigenous paradigm is apparent even with the influences of an antiquated mythology from the Near East. The force exerted by the followers of this Near Eastern mythos was apparent to the Native Americans. Perhaps Neolin and others like him were trying to tap into this force that seemed to continually drive them from their lands, corrupt their culture with 'gew-gaws' and bring horrific diseases like smallpox among Indian populations. Certainly the hieroglyph that Neolin used had strong influences from this Manichean mythos centred on a male war god.¹⁸

The best-known result of this revival movement was the conflict known as Pontiac's Rebellion. While performative violence such as riots, battles, massacres and wars are not technically part of this study, there is arguably a fine line between such acts and some of the performances under consideration here. Pontiac was an Ottawa leader who was reportedly influenced by Neolin's ideas of a cultural purification. The French had warned the Indians of the British rapacity

for land and many of the refugees in the Ohio country and Great Lakes knew this from experience. When the British began to occupy the forts of the French, the Indians as well as their French neighbours had to adapt to their presence. Indian trader and emissary for Pennsylvania colony George Croghan noted that the Indians of Canada were 'jealous' of the British and now that they had taken over North America they were even more so.¹⁹ There were numerous outbreaks of violence between 1763 and 1765 on the frontier between colonial and indigenous cultures, and for a variety of reasons. To illustrate how the line from performance to performative violence was crossed, one need only look at the Indian attack on the British fort at Michilimackinac in June of 1763.

The Native American game of *bag'gat'iway*, more commonly known as lacrosse, was very popular among the Indians. Many spectators watched this 'little brother of war' performed on a broad field by very athletic teams that numbered at times into the hundreds. The game played similar to the version in existence today, involving the use of a netted pole to hurl the ball toward the opponent's goal. The Indians, however, often played on a field over a mile in length, with posts approximately twelve inches in diameter driven into the ground on a slant at each end, with the end of the post serving as the goal.²⁰ At Michilimackinac, the Ojibwa leader Menhewehna called for a game to be played outside the British fort, which was not unusual. After all, the fort had long served as a trading post and the Indians had become comfortable there when it was occupied by the French. Now it was occupied by the English with whom the Ojibwa and others had recently been at war. When the game began, Captain George Ethrington and the officer he was about to replace, Lieutenant William Leslie, stepped outside the fort to watch, not realizing that Indian women were quietly carrying guns concealed by blankets into the fort. When all was prepared, one of the Indians threw the ball over the gate, which was the signal to begin an assault on the British. The attack was swift and successful. Fifteen British soldiers were killed and Ethrington and Leslie were taken prisoner.²¹

Had the British been more familiar with the nature of *bag'gat'iway*, they probably would have been more cautious and later they were. It was often a precursor to military action, as it was frequently seen as a ritual to summon the forces associated with animals and birds to give strength to the humans. There was meaning in this indigenous game that included 'other-than-human persons'. Because this was a performance that was sometimes a precursor to another level of the performative, namely war, it is appropriate to see this as a quasi-religious 'liminal'²² event. It represented the threshold between a game and war, the attack on Michilimackinac reveals how quickly this line could be crossed. These kinds of performances were found in colonial culture as well; not associated with a game as such, but the potential for street theatre to metamorphose into riot and murderous violence had long existed in European folk culture.

For the most part, theatre stages in the colonies of the so-called 'first British Empire' represented the 'polite' society of the bourgeoisie and its aspirants, although the theatre itself might serve a multitude of social purposes. Those who did not share the values of possessive individualism, often manifested as the pursuit of wealth and power, were those more inclined to embrace the values of religious or traditional cultures, European and American. Folk culture played an important role in the libertarian environment of North America and provided ready-made tropes for grass roots opposition to policies deemed unacceptable and an imposition by a distant government. As Jeffrey Richards and others have shown, theatre could be much more than a staged play, and in the British colonies it spilled into the street.²³ The French philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau, an advocate of popular sovereignty, called for more outdoor entertainments and festivities:

[L]et us not adopt these exclusive entertainments which close up a small number of people in melancholy fashion in a gloomy cavern, which keep them fearful and immobile in silence and inaction, which give them only prisons, lances, soldiers, and afflicting images of servitude and inequality to see.²⁴

Outdoor performance had long been a part of folk cultures, and pre-modern localism was part of the air the early British colonials breathed. Indeed, folk idioms were the heartbeat of pre-modern culture that nationalistic, abstract market economics disrupted. The lower classes who found their way to North America brought localism with them in forms unique to their source region, yet there was universality to seventeenth-century European peasant and artisan culture.²⁵ Folk culture was both a source of material for the early modern theatre and a point of departure for the culture of the market society. Localism had long had ways of using performance as a public service. 'Rough music' or 'skimmington' was a spontaneous, bawdy, and often violent public performance that impacted the way local dissent against perceived tyranny was expressed.

In North America, this type of performance also found a more serious and deadly expression *vis-à-vis* the Native Americans. An example of this was the attack by the 'Paxton Boys' on a group of Susquehannocks and other peaceful Native Americans living in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. In December 1763, in the aftermath of the French-Indian War and Pontiac's Rebellion, a group of Euro-Americans living in the Indian-White frontier village of Paxtang, near Harrisburg, attacked these peaceful Indians who had traded with Euro-Americans in the area for some time. These self-styled vigilantes, largely of Scotch-Irish heritage, were frustrated with the perceived lack of violent action by the Quaker-dominated Pennsylvania government against Indians in western Pennsylvania. After the Paxtons killed six unarmed Indians at their village, about fifty of them marched on the Lancaster workhouse where Governor John Penn

had given fourteen of the Susquehannocks protection. The vigilantes broke into the workhouse, then killed and mutilated all fourteen. Warrants for their arrest were issued, but no one would come forward to identify them. Eventually, about five hundred of these 'vigilantes' set out to 'cleanse' Pennsylvania of Indians. But since it was 200 miles over the mountains to Indian Country, they went after the 140 Indians who, after the murder of the innocent Susquehannocks, gathered in Philadelphia for protection. Benjamin Franklin raised British troops and Philadelphia militia to provide protection for the Indians, although in the end a third of them died of smallpox contracted in their refuge.²⁶

This was a reminder that street theatre could escalate into murder and indeed, assuaging the impulse to violence was one of its functions in the traditional folk cultures of Europe. Both the attack on Michilimackinac and the Paxton episode represent segments of the performance spectrum that reside between 'play', 'rough music' and the theatre of war. The story of the Paxton Boys was made into a play in the years following the event. Purportedly 'translated from the French by a Native of Dingall', it conflated the Paxton vigilantes with Presbyterians and 'Mob Rule'. In the play, the Presbyterians are upset that the 'Miscreants of the Established Church of England [protect the] heathen enemies ... against the Law of nature, the Law of Reason, and the Law of God'. The play²⁷ takes a humorous view of the Paxtons and essentially comments that the community needs to stand up to this overly 'democratical' behaviour. This behaviour was seen not only as a threat to Native Americans, but to the more organized approach to imperial expansion taken by centralized British power. In this example, one can see that the meanings of the performances of both the actual and dramatic Paxton Boys are complex. Crowd performances can and did cross the line from public protest to mass murder in the colonies. Yet, as historian Paul Gilje and others have observed, these performances had a specific function in ventilating plebian resentments, and were thus often uncontested or only mildly contested by authority.²⁸

Because this was an expanding empire, those possessing the object of the expansion were, after all, fair game. After the Anglo-Indian War of 1763–5, the Colonial Office of the British Crown became more interested in establishing a boundary between the Anglo colonists and the Indians. In the north, a treaty conference was called at Fort Stanwix. By this time the northern Indian Superintendent was William Johnson, who was on good terms with the Mohawks, on whose lands he had built an estate. A border between Indians and colonists had been the subject of informal talks between Johnson and the Indians since the departure of the French in 1763.²⁹ While it is apparently true that many details were worked out 'in the bushes', as the saying went, at Fort Stanwix and elsewhere, the minutes of the treaty ceremony belie the claim to conclusiveness of these earlier informal discussions.³⁰

William Johnson had been instructed by the Crown to establish the boundary with the Indians and keep the peace.³¹ Merchants who had lost goods during the Indian uprising as well land speculators – sometimes the same people – wanted lands in the Ohio country as far west as Illinois. Numerous land acquisition schemes targeted Johnson for favourable resolutions to their expansionist goal, including the Ohio Company, controversial land acquisitions in the Kayadoseras Patent north-west of Albany, fraudulent land sales to George Klock and the reimbursement in the form of Indian lands to merchants who lost trade goods in the recent insurgency.³² These imperial interests, that also included Sir William's interests, were counting on him to deliver the goods.³³ Speculators, of course, wanted the Indians to relinquish as much land as possible, and the possibility of a land grant from colonial governors between the Iroquois and Cherokee heartlands and west of the Appalachians was a key to their goals. There was more than one speculation consortium eyeing these lands, including the aforementioned Ohio Company.³⁴

The Condolence portion of the performance occupied the first two days of the conference during which the Six Nations' representatives bestowed a name to William Franklin, son of Benjamin and the Governor of New Jersey. Because they believed that he had recently executed individuals accused of murdering Indians, they gave him the name *Sagorighweyoghsta*, or 'Keeper of Justice'.³⁵ Johnson then laid out the map where he had drawn a line that would separate the British colonies from the Six Nations. This was the crucial part of the Fort Stanwix meeting. The Indians had been engaged in continuous discussions with the British since the close of the Pontiac-related hostilities in 1765. Johnson and most of his superiors had long known that a dividing line between the two peoples was critical to keeping the peace.³⁶ But he was the 'gatekeeper' in terms of Indian/White negotiations on the northern frontier, albeit a gatekeeper with British credentials and shares to the land speculation merger known as the Grand Ohio Company.³⁷

A hierarchy of power emerges in revisiting this jointly-acted frontier performance: the Six Nations claiming sovereignty over the Ohio Indians (and the British acknowledging the claim); the British claim to lands adequate to accommodate their colonists; and those colonists' claims to still more land for settlement and speculation. In the end, very few got what they wanted or even what was agreed upon at the treaty ceremony. The treaty had to be ratified in London, and there were many who opposed it.³⁸ The Six Nations wanted some previously-ceded lands to be withdrawn but white encroachment had continued beyond the Allegheny / Appalachian chain of mountains and British military action against the whites would have been necessary to accomplish this end. Some British officers, like General Thomas Gage, would probably have been up to the task and Johnson probably would have supported him. These two commis-

erated on the problems engendered by the 'lawless banditti' in the frontier regions and the inability and/or unwillingness of the colonial governments to resolve the problem.³⁹ The clear and natural boundary of the mountains was probably the last best hope for some sort of long-term Indian sovereignty. The followers of Neolin, Pontiac and other leaders of the 1763 uprising perhaps understood that. The British Crown, military officials like General Thomas Gage and the Indian Agent Johnson were well aware of the depredations by 'white savages' on the frontier, and that a boundary was a difficult necessity. Land speculators and settlers differed from officials like Johnson and Gage in that they felt that their projects should be supported and protected by the military. This difference was a cause of growing tensions between Tory and Whig politics in the colonies reflected in the different visions of empire emerging after the French-Indian War.

Nevertheless, unlike the treaty conferences of Lancaster, Logstown and others, it can be argued that there was never any intention on the part of colonial negotiators to adhere to the agreed upon terms. If they had, the 1768 Treaty of Fort Stanwix would have created – had the American Revolution not intervened – a new colony west of the Appalachians and south of the Ohio River. Names for the colony were already being floated – Franklin, Charlottiana, Vandalia – and there were new pressures on the Six Nations and, in the south, the Cherokees and their neighbours to cede still more lands.⁴⁰ Stanwix and the other treaty ceremonies were not truly 'colonial' performances on our spectrum, but something of an amalgamation. The formality of the Condolence ceremony was adopted, several hundred Indians attended the event, but the heart of the performance was a struggle over the right to occupy certain lands, capitalist land speculation was the driving force as was the indigenous desire to establish a secure boundary between themselves and the whites without losing access to the goods upon which they were now dependent.

The line of this boundary had been established in large part by the Stanwix treaty, but in the south, where the Cherokees were the power inhibiting imperial expansion, the Six Nations had less influence. There, land companies led by the Loyal Company paralleled the developments of the Ohio Company. The Loyal Company grant from the Virginia council, which amounted to 1,350,000 acres, was not saddled with a mandate to 'settle' the grant lands as the Ohio Company was; all their lands were open for speculation. However, the problem of the dividing line in the South still needed to be resolved and this was left to a treaty conference at Lochaber in 1770.

A detailed record of the Lochaber conference does not exist except for the ratified treaty, but it is certain that both treaties were violated almost immediately by white settlers. On the one hand, land speculators began surveying south of the Ohio, and settlers in the north continued their antagonizing of the Indians.⁴¹ Native Americans tried to compromise with this vanguard of the empire,

but it would ultimately prove to no avail. The impulse for individuals to establish their own micro-empires was more than the indigenous cultures could impede over the long term. As the empire in the form of these speculators and 'settlers' moved into the Trans-Appalachian frontier, many Indian groups retreated still further into the heart of the continent.

The aftermath of the treaties of Fort Stanwix and Lochaber brought out the conflicting interests operating in the colonies; not only among competing land and trading companies, but between the interests of some colonists and those of Britain. The troubles over the Stamp Act and Townshend Act were less relevant on the frontier where land speculators were willing to suffer Tory heavy-handedness as long as it got them more land. But colonial radicalism in the port towns, massive violation of frontier agreements and British reaction to both began to exacerbate relations with their colonists. The glories of the North American empire began to compete with the glories of 'Brittania'. There was a growing rift in the empire, and this was reflected in the performances on the North American frontier.

Keeping in mind that, from the perspective of the British metropole of London, the eastern seaboard of North America was still a *frontier* in the 1770s, student performances represent a unique insight into the creation of assumptions and myths in the burgeoning society. On 25 September 1771, graduating students at the College of New Jersey (later Princeton) heard the recitation entitled 'A Poem on the Rising Glory of America' at their commencement.⁴² Written by graduating students Hugh Henry Brackenridge and Philip Freneau, who both went on to some renown in the early republic, the poem was received with 'great applause' according to their classmate James Madison. It also went on to be published the next year and widely read in the colonies. It is still presented as an example of an early American 'native' cultural expression.

In September of 1771, the colonies were in the so-called 'Quiet Period'. The Stamp Act and its repeal, the Declaratory Act, the Townshend Acts and their repeal, the militant activities of the Sons of Liberty and the Boston 'Massacre' were recent events. To many colonists, British troops had become an army of occupation enforcing unpopular laws. In the poem by Brackenridge and Freneau, three 'swains' – Junio, Acasto and Leander – proclaim the glories of Anglo-America in no uncertain terms, and underscore the imperial heart of the colonial project. A few examples help to show that what is generally termed American republicanism was seen as compatible with economic empire and 'glory'. Leander proclaims:

No more of Memphis ... where the Ptolemies
Taught Golden Commerce to unfurl her falls
And bid fair science smile ... No more of Athens,
[Whose] sons of might genius [rose and]

Revived the Spirit of Liberty ...
 No more of Rome ... imperial Rome!
 Whose eagle flew [from the Ganges to Britain].
 No more of Britain and her kings renowned ...
 Illustrious senators, immortal bards,
 And wise philosophers.⁴³

Acasto then requests more of the 'strain / So new, so noble and full of fame' that will tell the tale of 'America's own sons, begin O muse!' – tell how 'the hero [Columbus] made his way' only to give way to the popish barbarities of Cortez and 'Indian blood to dye the sands, and choak / Fam'd Amazonia's stream with dead!' Unlike Britannia's sons, who, 'Undeluged with seas of Indian blood,' gain through their 'gen'rous breast' lands won 'by fair treaty', and 'conquer[ing] without blood'. This not only taps the 'Black Legend' of the Spanish Empire but provides a balm for those advocating expansion west of the mountains. In recent memory of course was the French–Indian War – a bloody affair that decimated many of the already-disrupted peoples of the Ohio country and featured biological warfare through the use of smallpox infested blankets by General Jeffrey Amherst and others.⁴⁴ But now, 'America's own sons', which is to say those of European descent born in North America, were the 'wise philosophers' expanding the empire republic for the good of all.

In this performed poem, Eugenio then relates how Britannia's Cabot and Raleigh have blazed the trail into this land of 'simple natives' who originated, Leander speculates, in Carthage (Tunisia). These 'savage men' were likely descended from those who broke the 'Roman yoke', sailed out of the Mediterranean, and were 'Caught by the eastern trade wind'. 'How fallen, Oh!' Leander laments – these folk who 'wander'd blindfolded down the steep of time / Dim superstition with her ghastly train / Of daemons, spectres, and forboding signs ... No fix'd abode their wand'ring genius knew'. It would interrupt this tale of heroism to point out the reasons for the seeming lack of a fixed abode among the Shawnee, Delaware, Tuscarora and many other peoples who had become a refugee population thanks to the destruction of their towns by an expanding economic empire. The 'daemons' and 'spectres' attest to the utter lack of comprehension these young Anglo poets had for the very successful and knowledgeable peoples they were condemning, denouncing as superstition what may have often been a sensitivity to their natural environment that had been lost to the European colonists. While this may have been the Age of Reason among the learned of imperial culture, there was no lack of 'superstition, daemons and spectres' among the Europeans as will be shown. But now, Acasto reminds the audience, 'Now fair-ey'd commerce stretches her white sails, / Learning exalts her head, the graces smile'. Thus Britannia has set herself amid this alleged darkness, pursuing, 'The glorious cause that urg'd our fathers first / To visit climes unknown'. Eugenio

observes that 'by persecution wrong'd / and popish cruelty, our fathers came / From Europe's shores to find this blest abode / Secure from tyranny and hateful man'. In this construction, Britain is Rome, Native Americans are Carthage, and the script of the Third Punic War was that Rome destroyed Carthage, making the British conquest of North America seem natural and inevitable: As Cato put it 'Carthago delenda est'.⁴⁵

In Britain's realm, 'more noble riches flow / From agriculture and the industrious swain, / Who tills the fertile vale or mountain's brow, 'Content to lead a safe, a humble life / 'Midst his own native hills', Acasto muses. 'Long has the rural life been justly fam'd', Leander announces, and the British project in America comes from a tradition where, 'Fair agriculture, not unworthy of kings, / Once exercis'd the royal hand'. Here is expressed an aspect of the 'Country' version of British Whiggism where landed property and independence gave rise to 'virtuous swains' who criticized patronage in Parliament, public credit, and the presence of standing armies.⁴⁶ This represents a strain of republicanism that J. G. A. Pocock has traced back through the Interregnum and Civil War to the Italian Renaissance and beyond.⁴⁷ In the poem it is conflated with the leading edge of the imperial project, perpetuated by visions of economic empire and based on a 'system of public finance by a class of great landed proprietors'.⁴⁸ When the landed proprietors found their colonial legislatures disdained by King-in-Parliament, the 'Country' radical narrative had much to offer them. This section of the performance reveals the ambiguity of Whiggism at the heart of the first British Empire and the evolution of one of its scions into an American strain.

The worship of the mythological fallen War Hero is present in the poem, with a decided lack of nuance regarding the purpose of the war or the circumstances of the fall. Fighting against 'false Gallia's sons', the 'British standard awes the coward host'.

General James Wolfe, fallen British commander of the Battle of Quebec in 1759 is championed: 'What Heart but mourns the untimely fate of Wolf [*sic*] / who dying conquer'd, or what breast but beats / To share a fate like his, and die like him?' And this benevolent Empire of Britannia's sons shall conquer the 'dreary wastes and awful solitudes' of North America and 'spread / Dominion to the north and south and west / Far from th' Atlantic to Pacific shores'. The phenomenon of 'Manifest Destiny' is usually associated with the 1840s, but here is that basic notion before the American Revolution, and associated with the long-term expansion of the Empire. Referencing the 'exil'd seer in Patmos isle', i.e., the revelation of John and the end of the world, 'A new Jerusalem sent down from heaven / Shall grace our happy earth' and 'Paradise a new / Shall flourish, by no second Adam lost / No dang'rous tree or deathful fruit shall grow / No tempting serpent to allure the soul'. Here is the Puritan mythos, a self-percep-

tion among Euro-Americans of being the chosen people to bring about another Eden.

While this dramatic poem was not as widely performed as the stock plays of 'polite' society, it nevertheless represents another nexus of mythological archetypes in this paean to America's 'rising glory'. The pursuit of resources and markets was the driving force of the Anglo-American Empire and this would only intensify after the political break with England. This poem, published and often performed on the stages of commencement proceedings, dedications and other similar events, embodies many of the mythic images in the minds of various and sundry colonists on the leading edge of empire.

A play by George Cockings expounded on this theme of military glory. *The Conquest of Canada* apparently was performed only twice in the colonies after its premier in London in 1766. Both of these performances occurred in February 1773, the year before theatre was banned as conflict with the Mother Country intensified. The huge cast and machinery needed for such a production probably explains its short-lived career in America, but it was also true that the tensions between the colonists and England were increased by the real 'Conquest of Canada.' The Proclamation Line of 1763 which forbid colonial expansion to the west, and its ratification of the Treaty of Fort Stanwix of 1768 and of Lochaber in 1770 were the frontier equivalent of the Stamp Act, but these were not repealed.

In the Great Lakes region, where the British Empire was under less pressure from the colonists of the eastern seaboard to usurp Indian lands, relations with the native peoples were better. By the time the Revolution began in earnest, many Indians in that region had committed to an allegiance with the British. General Henry Hamilton was the Lieutenant Governor of Detroit from 1775 until his capture at Vincennes by George Rogers Clark in 1779. He kept of journal of his activities in 1778–9 that included his interaction with the Indians. In order to maximize his relationship with the Indians, Hamilton embraced the world of indigenous performance. In the summer and autumn of 1778, Hamilton's journal recorded his movements throughout the Maumee area of modern-day north-west Ohio. Historian Richard White characterized the indigenous performance events of this march as 'the calumet ceremony, war feasts, 'eat all' feasts, the giving of war belts, the accepting of the hatchet, war dances, war songs, the whetting of the grindstone with rum to sharpen the hatchet of war, ceremonies to secure the approval of manitous'. And he notes that they had been adopted by Europeans, or they had least been 'long recognized and discussed'. Historian White characterizes Hamilton's attitude toward the Indians as condescending, although he did participate in some of their rituals. However, White neglects to analyse these rituals in terms of paradigmatic constructions of indigenous and colonial world views.⁴⁹

True, Hamilton was condescending toward the 'Savages', but considering the fact that he was steeped in the insular British imperial culture, insular compared to the French, his willingness to participate in indigenous performance patterns is striking. Compared to the actions of Jeffrey Amherst or William Trent, who deliberately traded smallpox-infested blankets to the Indians in order to wipe out 'this execrable race',⁵⁰ Hamilton was downright accommodating. For example, on the evening of 13 October, the Chippewas (Ojibwas) invited Hamilton to a feast in a camp characterized by shelters constructed along either side of a fire about fifty feet long. Only men were present; a bear was being cooked in a large kettle over the fire. The participants in the performance were painted with vermillion and had their arms tied to a stake by a 'War Belt'. The meat in the kettle was cut into equal slices, and the 'servant' gave out choice pieces of the meat to the participants, who waited patiently until all were served. The office of the servant, known as Mishinnawey, was a great honour which required, as Hamilton put it, 'strength, alacrity and wonderful patience, a slavish cowardly fellow could not be promoted to this dignity'⁵¹. Hamilton observed that, unlike in English society, 'no reproachfull or angry expression falls from any person when the servant makes a mistake or fails any way in his duty ... there is no such thing found in their language as an oath or a curse'.⁵² The communal nature of the indigenous paradigm put the health and functionality of the community and of individuals on a more equal footing than in the colonial paradigm. There were animosities and violence to be sure, but what modern society might call volunteerism was an assumption which put interpersonal relations, in many ways, on a more civil level. Many of the captivity narratives where the captives stopped resisting incorporation into the tribal social structure reveal a striking degree of acceptance and civility, much more so than instances of the reverse situation.⁵³

What Hamilton describes next is indicative of an 'indigenous' performance. After invoking what Hamilton calls the 'Master of life', in which the Indians gave the customary 'yo-hah!' at the end of each statement, the 'priest' then invoked more specific 'other-than-human persons'. Observing their beseeching of the 'inferior spirits presiding over rivers, Woods, Mountains, to be propitious', Hamilton was moved by the Indians' 'deepest silence and most serious attention' to the prayer; 'no such thing as laughing or whispering, so common in our places of Worship'. Noting, as few sources do, the beauty of the starlit night as part of the indigenous performance milieu, the General noted that he was 'affected by humble and reverential worship of these poor ignorant but well meaning creatures'.⁵⁴

After the ceremonial performance, the Indians began consuming the bear 'with great keenness', eating even the skin. The bear's head was taken up by the 'Master of the Feast' and, giving a war cry echoed by all present, he sang his war song. Hamilton recounted the event:

[A]ccompanied by the dance as usual, all the company marking the measure by a deep expiration coming from the bottom of their lungs, with a correspondent action of the Body and head, having made the circuit of the fire he laid the head at my feet – I followed his example carefully avoiding stepping over the fire, which is against their rules ... some Chiefs followed, and some took a bite of the head, saying 'twas the head of the Great Knife, so they stile the Virginians – after these a young Ottawa chief danced, and being of the nation invited by the Chippowews, kept the head for himself.⁵⁵

Given our understanding of the indigenous discourse from a variety of sources previously mentioned, the power of the bear is the 'other-than-human person' being evoked in this performance. The fact that each leader, including Hamilton, danced around the fire with the bear's head supports this analysis. Hamilton embraced the indigenous paradigm in order to maintain his much-needed allies in a conflict with the 'Great Knives', but one is left with the sense that this performance made a lasting impression on him. Hamilton, in his mindset as an agent of the British Empire, was nevertheless moved by the power of the performance in what most colonists' would call 'wilderness' but to Native Americans was simply the world in which they were embedded. The 'poor, ignorant but well-meaning creatures' were living their mythic construction of the earth as they found it.

The Indians told Hamilton about the recalcitrance of the American army to engage in the traditional treaty ceremonies. Upon arriving at Vincennes, the Americans had presented two belts to the Miami people who were there, led by Gros Loup, one was red and the other green, telling the Indians that if they wanted war to take the first, if not to take the latter. This was an adaptation of the *wampum* exchange put into the context of the American colonial paradigm; in other words, there was to be no negotiation, it was an ultimatum. One young Pottawatomie expressed a desire to bury his tomahawk in their heads, but that he deferred to the advice of the elders for the safety of his wife and children. This ultimatum approach to Indian relations would become increasingly familiar after the Americans won their independence from Britain.⁵⁶

Performances that accompanied the warpath were common in this relationship between the British troops under Hamilton's command and his indigenous allies. One such performance was given by a Miami leader Waspikingua, also known by his French name Le Petit Gris, in which he exhorted his followers:

Young men! We are now going to war, should any dispute arise among you, or hasty words pass, recollect that your busyness is War and let it pass unnoticed. War is sometimes necessary and the consequence to many must be death – let us bear in mind that some of us must fall, and the rest return in mourning, but that thought must not deter us from doing our duty. We must die when it is the will of the Supreme Being the master of life. We are here mixed with the English, the French and several different tribes of the brown skins, let us not take offence at anything which may be said, since we are unacquainted as well with their language as their customs – however let

no man even in joke use a threatening gesture with his knife, or his War axe. These people (the Christians) have not the same religion with us. We believe in the Deities of the woods and rivers, as well as in the supreme lord, they believe only in one sovereign being presiding over all. Our method of making war is by surprise, Our father the Englishman has another method, however let us act our part as men, we must expect shot to fall as thick as drops of rain, but we are no more than men, born to die –⁵⁷

While this is not a ritual performance *per se*, it shows that in the indigenous paradigm the differences between the Native Americans and Europeans were more likely to be overlooked by the Indians than the Europeans. This shows the tolerant nature of the indigenous paradigm; the religion of the British is not judged, but simply accepted as their world view. After all, in the face of war, differences were minimal if not irrelevant.

On the night of 23 November 1778, as was common during their march to war with the Virginians, the Indians in Hamilton's army performed songs and dances dedicated to what Hamilton characterized as 'Budgets [small pouches better known as 'medicine bundles'] which contain little figures of different kinds, some as Amulets, some as household Gods, these when they go to war they paint with vermillion'. In an illustration that captures the complete immersion into what the 'colonial' paradigm calls the 'natural' world, Hamilton describes the toolkit of native healers. Calling them 'Juglers' who are 'provided with an apparatus very different from our quacks', he writes that in their 'budgets' they carry: '[H]eads, bones or skins of certain animals, preserved Birds in the feather, Snakes skins, Bows and arrows contrived with springs to bundle up with the other valuable effects, Wolves teeth, Panthers claws, Eagles talons &ca.'

Performance was a big part of healing in the indigenous paradigm. Sometimes, Hamilton reports, these 'Juglers' would 'pretend to swallow arrows, eat fire and take down live birds'. At times there was an aura not unlike the colonials' circus in these performances. But the commingling of human and other-than-human persons was the most powerful aspect of indigenous performance:

When the camp fires are lighted and when the Warriors have finished their meal, the Priest goes in the front of the encampment and begins his incantation. The Budget being a few paces before him- at the full extent of his Voice he roars out his prayer or adjuration, which is in a tone between melancholic and terrific. The various tunes in various languages bellowed aloud by these Heralds of the night, the thickness of the Woods and darkness of the Weather with the blaze of a great many large fires extending along the Savage camp for a considerable length, the intervals of silence from time to time broken by these horrible Songs, sometimes by a Chorus of wolves in full cry after the Deer, formed a very strange but striking medley. Every nation has his Magus changing in front of the Camp at one time, vying with each other in strength of lungs, at these times they pretend that their devotion procures them the sight of their Genius, and as their fasts are sometimes very severe, I should not be surprised if an empty stomach produced a light head and made visionaries of them.⁵⁸

The power of indigenous performances is captured somewhat in this description. The unity of the human and other-than-human environment is implicated, and the use of fasts not only as supplication but to physically induce a hallucinatory experience is not lost on Hamilton.

One could argue that the entire process of marching to war was a performance, particularly in the indigenous paradigm. On 8 December 1778, the Indians that made up the bulk of Hamilton's train reminded him of his promise to allow them their customs in this march, and their war ceremonies required that they camp some distance away from the English. In spite of the arrival of a bitter cold front, the Indians continued with their performances in the evening, singing songs 'in uncouth but melancholy strains ... singing the war song at each separate camp of their tribes and our detachment'.⁵⁹ One of the Indian *sachems* gave a performance that underscores the universality of these events. Facing the woods with his 'medicine bundle' hanging from forked sticks, he sang a song accompanying himself with a rattle shaken at consistent intervals. During pauses in the song, he 'howled like a Wolf, snorted like a horse, or imitated the cry of some wild beast or bird – sometimes he uttered three distinct howls so loud and at the same time so dismal, as might have made the Knight of the fulling Mills tremble.' Moreover, on their way to battle, the Indians would put their medicine bundles between themselves and the enemy, whether they were in their canoes, in camp or in the field.⁶⁰

Hamilton occupied Fort Vincennes on the Wabash River, it having been abandoned by the colonials. However, in March 1779, George Rogers Clark led an army of colonials, Indians, and French settlers against Hamilton at the Fort. Hamilton, dependent on over 200 French settlers himself to defend the fort, was unable to assure himself of their continued allegiance against their own neighbours and relatives. The French had officially entered the war on the side of the colonials at this point, and many French settlers felt duty bound to resist the British and side with the Americans. The result for Hamilton and the Indians of the Wabash country was a military defeat, with Hamilton being captured and the Fort retaken.

For General Henry Hamilton, this was certainly a frontier experience. But it is not inaccurate to consider places like Boston and Philadelphia as part of the imperial frontier. As the colonials became increasingly radicalized over their differences with the metropole, 'European decadence' was targeted. This 'decadence' was most clearly represented, especially to the northern colonists, by the theatre. The theatre season of 1773 was one of the best seasons for David Douglass's American Company of Comedians in their history. But due to the escalating tensions and potential violence between the Britain and the colonies, the following year the First Continental Congress passed a resolution to:

[E]ncourage frugality, economy, and industry, and promote agriculture, arts and the manufactures of this country, especially that of wool; and will discountenance and discourage every species of extravagance and dissipation, especially all horseracing, and all kinds of gaming, cock-fighting, exhibitions of shews, plays, and other expensive diversions and entertainments.⁶¹

Passed some months before the Lexington-Concord confrontation, this resolution indicates the seriousness with which the twelve signatory colonies took the events of 1774, particularly the 'Intolerable Acts', which added martial law to the relations between colonies and Mother Country. By the time of the Revolutionary War, performance in the colonies reflected the ambiguity and diversity within the imperial structure – Whig, Tory, radical – that characterized this relatively libertarian milieu. For those who frequented the theatre of the larger towns, the mythology of the libertarian empire had been internalized. The language of commercial expansion was the rhetorical coin of the realm for them.

General John 'Gentleman Johnny' Burgoyne, stationed in Boston after the outbreak of revolution, set out, as many British officers did, to bring the culture of the metropole to the provinces. Brushing aside Massachusetts law, (not considered valid *vis-à-vis* King-in-Parliament anyway), Burgoyne and his staff produced a number of plays including *Zara*, *Tamerlane*, and *The Busybody* and one farce, *The Blockade of Boston*, written by himself. *Blockade*, now lost, reportedly lampooned the Whig cause and caricatured General Washington as a buffoon. As Boston resident Dorothy Dudley reported, 'How our Boston buildings are desecrated by the British soldiers! Faneuil Hall, which has rung with the elegance of patriots, is used as a theatre, where ridiculous plays are performed and our army and its commanders turned into sport.' Dudley goes on to say that Washington was represented as 'an uncouth countryman, dressed shabbily, with large whig [*sic*] and long, rusty sword'.⁶² The performance of this play had been known two weeks in advance when the pro-Whig *New England Chronicle* announced that:

We are informed that there is now getting up at the Theatre, and will be performed in the course of a Fortnight, a new Farce, called the Blockade of Boston. (*It is more probably, before that time, the poor wretches will be presented with a Tragedy, called the BOMBARDMENT of Boston.*)⁶³

The Continentals used this distraction to initiate an attack on Charlestown, near Boston, that would coincide with the play's presentation. Their intent was to burn the abandoned houses that the British were using for fuel. The presentation of *The Blockade of Boston* went forward, and in the midst of a scene, according to Dudley, a sergeant ran onto the stage shouting, 'The Yankees are attacking our works on Bunker Hill!' Some thought it was part of the play until the players themselves began to remove their costumes and prepare for battle.

Approximately one hundred American soldiers were raiding Charlestown, burning houses and taking prisoners. According to Dudley only one Englishman was killed and there were no American casualties.⁶⁴ Here was a case of the theatres of war and the stage colliding: the culture of empire meets the battle for empire, albeit couched as a battle for sovereignty.

From the perspective of a critical analysis of empire, it is no small irony that Dorothy Dudley's next entry, for 22 January, would make mention of a visit by the 'Caghnawaga tribe' to General Washington's camp near Boston. She describes how they were lavished with gifts and shown around to the various military positions. Dudley herself, who met them at a dinner party in their honour, was impressed with their courtesy and sense of formality, 'in their Indian fashion'. These Indians were the descendants of those 'converted' by French Jesuits in the seventeenth century. Eventually known as the Caughnawaga Mohawks or French Mohawks, they were not merely converted, but removed onto reservations to prevent 'recidivism' or the recanting of their Christianity. Part of the Iroquois Confederacy and mostly Mohawk, the Caughnawaga had occupied the head of the Mahican Channel (the Hudson Valley, Lake Champlain, and the Richelieu Valley to Montreal), making their friendship a boon to those wishing to travel this perilous route. Indeed, Caughnawaga Mohawks near Montreal and the traditional Mohawks near Albany had long facilitated trade between British New York and French Canada.⁶⁵ As middle-men that essentially served as porters in the smuggling trade between the British and French empires they, and other Iroquois, allied with the English Whig imperialists' renewed effort to extend their interests to the West. As this trade and expansion continued through the eighteenth century, the Caughnawagas' and Whig expansionists' interests increasingly coincided, making them, by the mid 1770s, natural allies of the colonial rebels – both were engaged in usurping this portion of the empire from the London metropole.⁶⁶ The reasons for the presence of the Caughnawaga delegates in Boston in 1776 were deeply rooted in the imperial dynamics of North America, as are Dorothy Dudley's references to 'British tyranny'. This was considered the only acceptable position for indigenous peoples to take *vis-à-vis* the economic empire, any other position made them vulnerable to attempts to exterminate or remove them.

It is not a coincidence that while the Continentals were rejecting the British Empire, they were also – *almost* – rejecting its theatre. The exceptions to this rejection were rare, but they underscore the association of the continental elite with the culture of empire. The presentation of at least two plays, one of which was Joseph Addison's *Cato: A Tragedy*, was ordered by Washington at Valley Forge in the spring of 1778 after the dismal winter the troops had spent there. George Ewing, whose journal recorded the event of the first play (which he does not name), wrote that although he had a ticket he was unable to get inside the

'Bake House' where the play was performed, because of the crowd. He and his fellow junior officers repaired to 'Major Parker's hut', where a fine 'frolic' was had by all regardless of missing the show.⁶⁷ Other plays planned for the Bake House at Valley Forge were *The Padlock*, *The Recruiting Officer* and *The Fair Penitent* were stock plays of the day.⁶⁸ So although the Continental Congress had banned plays, the troops occasionally hedged on the ban and when they did so presented stock plays of the British Empire.⁶⁹

The performances at Valley Forge were in part a response to British festivities in Philadelphia, which were no secret to the Continentals. General William Howe's occupation of Philadelphia was characterized by an attempt to recreate London's festive air in a town built up by Quaker colonists. There was a respectable number of Tory sympathizers, however – enough to make the dinners, balls and theatre events well attended.⁷⁰ Becky Franks told her friend Nancy Paca, wife of Maryland Continental Congress delegate William Paca, that the British had quite enlivened the town. While the custom in Philadelphia society was to attend a ball in couples, regardless of marital status, the British custom was for women to 'play the field', and mingle with numerous partners. Franks wrote:

I spent Tuesday evening at Sir Wm. Howe's, where we had a concert and dance. No loss for partners, even I am engaged to seven different gentlemen, for you must know 'tis a fix'd rule never to dance but two dances at a time with the same person.⁷¹

Franks was a member of that subset of colonial society that was deeply engaged in the culture of empire – in this case the British version of 'politeness' and ambition that were prerequisites to acceptance into the colonial elite.

The most grand of the performances in occupied Philadelphia stands above the stock plays of the day and deserves mention as a striking example of British imperial culture; indeed, its pomp and ceremony harking back to the days of divine right monarchy. General William Howe and his officer corps had a penchant for extravagant performances which found their culmination in the so-called 'Mischianza' (sometimes spelled 'Mescheanza'), orchestrated in April of 1778 – about the same time of the theatrical activities at the Valley Forge 'Bake House'. This was billed as a celebration of Howe's departure from North America following his resignation as commander of British forces in the colonies. But in order to appreciate the significance of the Mischianza, one needs to briefly summarize Howe's career in North America.

Howe had distinguished himself under General Wolf's command in the French-Indian War. It was Howe's troops who successfully scaled the cliffs below Quebec City in the dark and enabled the defeat of the French on the Plains of Abraham in 1759. Military successes at Louisburg, Montreal, and Havana during that war of empires further added to his growing stature as a military leader. He introduced new light infantry tactics and training that allowed large num-

bers of men to move rapidly and stealthily, influencing in the long term the way war would be conducted in the British Empire and beyond. In addition to these military distinctions, Howe served in Parliament along with numerous army officers, including Generals Burgoyne and Cornwallis. He represented the town of Nottingham in the House of Commons, having been elected to replace his brother George, III Viscount Howe, who was killed at the battle of Ticonderoga in 1758. The death of his brother in that battle could be one reason why Howe did not act more aggressively in his later campaigns against the American army. Historians largely believe, as did many members of Parliament and colonial loyalists, that Howe had pulled some punches in 1776–7. Viscount Howe had been very popular among the colonists during the French–Indian War, being one of the few British officers who would have direct dealings with them. The Massachusetts Assembly had raised money to erect a monument to him at Westminster Abby. Sir William and a third brother, Lord Richard Howe, the commander of British naval forces in the Revolutionary War, appreciated that gesture.

Howe went on to command the occupying forces of New York in 1776. After driving Washington's army from Long Island in 1776, Howe had moved his army from New York to the head of Delaware Bay in May 1777 and on to Philadelphia. During this period, although he did defeat Washington at the Battle of Brooklyn and at the Brandywine, Howe minimized his losses in other continental victories. Howe reportedly could have destroyed Washington's army on a number of occasions, including while he was in Philadelphia, but simply decided not to pursue the Continentals electing, he later argued, not to make his forces overly vulnerable. Having fought his way into Philadelphia in the summer of 1777, the bourgeois culture of Philadelphia welcomed Howe and the theatre flourished during his stay. This focus on Philadelphia, many historians argue, cost Burgoyne the Battle of Saratoga that autumn. Burgoyne had thought Howe was part of his offensive in the north. Lord George Germain, First Viscount Sackville, the overall commander of British forces in the New World, apparently had allowed the two generals to pursue separate engagements without one knowing what the other was doing.⁷² He made the same mistake at Yorktown with Generals Clinton and Cornwallis.⁷³

A cloud hung over Howe's command by the spring of 1778 as Howe had been recalled to London. The extravagance of the Mischianza was an effort to counteract the negative circumstances under which Howe was to depart for London on 24 May, six days after the event. Indeed, Major John André, probably the primary planner and organizer of the Mischianza, sent a letter on the ship that bore Howe back to England describing the event and the gloom that hung over his command: '[N]ot even the pleasure of conversing with my friend', he wrote, 'can secure me from the general dejection I see around me, or remove the share

I must take in the universal regret and disappointment which his approaching departure hath spread throughout the whole army.⁷⁴

Twenty-two field officers contributed £140 apiece to a pre arranged plan, with preparations managed by a committee of four officers. Following examples of specific festivals held by and for the royal courts of England and France, the affair began with a fleet bearing the British generals, including Lord Admiral Howe, brother of Sir William and commander of the Royal Navy in the New World. Three galleys bore the Howes, Sir Henry Clinton and Lord Charles Cornwallis respectively. The galleys had on each quarter five flat boats festooned with green cloth and bearing 'ladies and gentlemen' invited to the event. The fleet was led by three flat boats with a military band in each. Six barges surrounded the whole to keep onlookers, of which there were many, at bay. Men-of-War, transport ships, and other merchant vessels docked nearby flew a full display of their flags in honour of the occasion. A coordinated landing was disrupted by the flood-tide which forced the slower barges back in the procession. The landing was by the 'Old Fort' at the south end of the town, with festivities to recommence at the residence of the late Joseph Wharton, which overlooked the river from a gentle slope about four hundred yards away. When the Howes' galley landed, the nearby *HMS Roebuck* fired a seventeen-gun salute, soon followed by the same from the *HMS Vigilant*. On the lane leading to the Wharton house, two files each of grenadiers and light horse lined the way to a field one hundred and fifty yards square surrounded by troops in formation. The whole was arrayed in the tradition of a 'tilt and tournament, according to the customs of ancient chivalry'.⁷⁵

The company passed through two triumphal arches, elaborately decorated – one for Sir William and one for Lord Howe. Two pavilions with risers surrounded the tournament field and soon filled with the invited spectators. At a trumpet signal, six knights on grey horses, attended by their esquires and clad in red and white silks, entered the field. Four trumpeters and a herald led the group. On the herald's tunic was their insignia – two entwined roses – with the motto 'We Droop When Separated'. Lord Cathcart was the chief of these 'Knights of the Blended Rose' and was accompanied by two young black slaves wearing blue and white silk sashes and drawers, with silver clasps on their necks and arms, holding Cathcart's stirrups.⁷⁶ Two officers walked alongside, one bearing his lance and the other his shield. His personal 'device' depicted on a standard was Cupid riding on a horse with the motto, 'Surmounted by Love'. Each subsequent knight entered the field, each with similar array – esquires, 'devices' with mottos, and each bore a coloured ribbon that corresponded to a ribbon borne by one of the maidens on the sidelines. André names and describes each knight's livery in his account. When these knights had circled the ring, the herald announced the knights' challenge:

The Knights of the Blended Rose, by me their Herald, proclaim and assert that the Ladies of the Blended Rose excel in wit, beauty, and every accomplishment, those of the *whole World*; and, though any Knight or Knights be so hardy as to dispute or deny it, they are ready to enter the lists with them, and maintain their assertions by deeds of arms, according to the laws of ancient chivalry.

With that, a 'Black Herald' entered the field, ordered his trumpets to sound, and six more knights entered with the same pomp and ceremony as the previous company. These 'Knights of the Burning Mountain', clad in black and orange livery, each with an insignia and coloured ribbons that corresponded to another set of young ladies on the sidelines, accepted the challenge of a tournament displaying 'deeds of arms'. A tournament then ensued, with the 'knights' play-acting jousting and fencing skills for the enjoyment of the assembled spectators. In the end, the ladies under dispute stepped in and announced that they could not bear to witness the shedding of their knights' blood, that knights and ladies of both sides were equally virtuous and that the tournament be ended and the revelry begin. The festival at that point transformed into a feast, then a formal ball, and subsequently a drinking bout that lasted all night. In sum, because Sir William was leaving the colonies to face a questioning Parliament under the colour of shame, and his officers wanted to leave him with an honour befitting their esteem for him, they organized this extravaganza to mitigate the effects of his being 'called on the carpet'.⁷⁷

The Mischianza is a reminder of the wealth and luxury that was, for imperial elites, an expectation – a norm to be maintained by public policy and by access to the public trough that enabled such wealth to be spent in a ritual emphasizing the perceived glories of those at the top of this culture of empire. For the trap-pings alone, Howe's officers spent over £3,000.

This did not set well with the Quaker population who, at least officially, remained neutral. The Quakers' history at this point had been one of a people who had attempted to deal with the Native Americans on a relatively peaceful footing. This attempt at peaceful relations had long been compromised by Indian-hating expansionists ranging from the Paxton Boys to the smallpox blankets of General Amherst. Unlike the majority of Puritans, the Quakers under William Penn had been insistent on making honest land deals with the Indians. The theatrical events in Philadelphia represented to the Quakers the kind of imperial culture they saw as corrupt. Quaker diarist Elizabeth Drinker's commentary on the Mischianza festival put on for the benefit of the Howe brothers is unambiguous:

May 18, 1778: 'this day may be remembered by many, from the Scenes of Folly and Vanity, promoted by the Officers of the Army under pretence of shewing respect to Gen. Howe, now about leaving them – the parade of Coaches and other Carriages with many Horsemen, thro' the Streets towards the No. Liberties, were great numbers

of the Officers and some Women embark'd in three Gallies, and a number of boats, and pass'd down the River, befoe the City, with Colours display'd, a large Band of Music, and the Ships in the Harbour decorated with Colours, saluted by the Canon of some of them; it is said they landed in south wark, and proceeded from the waterside to Joseph Whartons late dwelling, which has been decorated and fitted for this occasion – in an expensive way, for this Company to Feast, Dance, and Revel in, – on the River Sky-Rockets and other Fire Works, were exhibited after Night. – How insensible do these people appear, while our Land is so greatly desolated, and Death and sore destruction has overtaken and impends over so many.'

Unlike the Congregationalists in New England, Quakers had maintained a relatively anti-imperial stance throughout their stay in North America. Indeed, during the French–Indian War, Indians raiding British outposts in Pennsylvania spared the Quakers their wrath – the Quakers had always treated them kindly. The attendees of the Friends' Yearly Meeting for Pennsylvania and New Jersey at Burlington in West New Jersey officially expressed gratitude 'for the peculiar favour extended and continued to our Friends and Brethren in profession, none of whom have we have yet heard been Slain nor carried into Captivity.'⁷⁸

The Quakers had stayed out of the wars of empire in the New World since King Williams' War began in the 1690s. Their peaceful relations with the Indians was compromised however when the Scots, Scots-Irish, and Germans began to immigrate into Pennsylvania. Ironically, it was the Quakers' pacifism that had attracted them in the first place in the hope they would find refuge from these same imperial wars.⁷⁹ But the treaties between William Penn and the Delaware people nevertheless brought amicability between colonials and indigenes into public consciousness. This would prove influential when the colonials began searching for an indigenous cultural self-identification.

As for the Quakers and the empire in Philadelphia, the departure of the British in 1778 did not translate into a departure of an imperial culture. In July, a month after the Continental Army had reoccupied the city, Mary (White) Morris, wife of the financier Robert Morris, wrote to her mother regarding conditions in the town:

I know of no news, unless to tell you that we are very gay as such. We have a great many balls and entertainments, and soon the Assemblys will begin. Tell Mr. Hall even our military gentlemen here are too liberal to make any distinctions between Whig and Tory ladies – if they make any, it's in favor of the latter, such, strange as it may seem, is the way things are conducted at present in this city.⁸⁰

Although some Whigs were still bitter about the Tory hospitality to the British as exemplified by the *Mischianza*, apparently the Whig officers and Tory 'belles' danced together even at the first ball given at the City Tavern after the British occupation.⁸¹ In the South, after the devastating conquest of Charleston by the British army, General Henry Clinton's forces of occupation held concerts

and balls during the theatre season of early 1781. Amateur plays were apparently staged, and there were rumours of the return of the Lewis Hallam troupe – the American Company of Comedians – the following winter.⁸² Hallam's return, seemingly, was dependent on an overall British victory in the colonies since even South Carolina, like the northern colonies and Continental Congress, had quashed the staging of plays since the 1773 Tea Act and subsequent unrest.⁸³ Of course, that victory did not occur, yet Hallam did return with his company after the war. It would become known as the 'Old American Company', and they would pursue a successful career staging a new kind of imperial culture well into the nineteenth century.

The theatre of the American Revolution, split along fault lines between stage, street and closet, reveals the struggle between imperial forces over issues of economic and political control of this portion of the British Empire. The narrow cultural foci in the historiography of this area of study have minimized the imperial nature of the 'Glorious Cause'.⁸⁴ This chapter has presented a spectrum of performances, from the unambiguously indigenous to the pomp and ceremony of imperial culture. Without a critical perspective of empire to clear the air of nationalistic constructions, this history remains obscured. This broader spectrum of performance removes the pedestal upon which Euro-American revolutionaries have been placed, and reveals a more realistic picture of events. Indigenous and colonial performances provide a proper context for this view and, as the superficial 'politeness' of bourgeois theatre is stripped away, the visceral nature of this proto-Manifest Destiny is revealed.

3 PERFORMING THUNDERBIRDS AND HAPPY INDIANS

In the 111-volume series 'Narratives of Indian Captivities' published by Garland Press, it is easy to be pulled into the marketing strategies of the original writers and publishers of these narratives. The focus is predominately on the perceived depredations and savagery of the native population. Reading them one after another, one feels the pull to forget that these presentations are designed to extract money from the pockets of buyers, many of whom want to know that their expanding 'empire republic' is on the side of the angels. This is the nature of the phenomenon that falls under the rubric of the 'colonial' or 'imperial' culture. There are balanced accounts in the collection to be sure; accounts that acknowledge the humanity of indigenous peoples. But in most, cultural differences are maximized and the horrors of the 'mourning wars', for instance, where captives are executed to appease the spirits of those recently dead, are stressed. One is led to believe that these features were predominant in indigenous cultures. However, by seeking out the performances in these narratives and analysing them and their place on the indigenous-colonial spectrum, a more balanced picture emerges.

The reality that can be gleaned from more balanced narratives paints a different picture as captured in Jonathan Alder's description of Indian life north of the Ohio River in the 1780s and '90s. Alder was a young man who had lived with the Indians since being taken from his family's farm in 1781 at the tender age of seven by a group of raiders – Indian and white – looking for hostages to trade. Alder ended up in the Indian village at Mack-a-Chack in modern-day central Ohio where he was raised by a Shawnee mother and Mingo father. He became acculturated to Indian ways and his memoir provides an invaluable look into the culture of the 'Ohio Indians', including a view of frontier violence from the Indians' perspective. This chapter examines the frontier performances of Indians and whites in the years following the Revolution, and Alder's view of frontier violence as it affected indigenous village life is an invaluable precursor to this narrative.

Whites always attacked in the autumn, he wrote, seemingly to destroy the Indians' crops and make them unable to cope with the long winter. Towns were burned, crops destroyed, hunting grounds made too dangerous, women and children made homeless at a crucial time of year, 'while the warriors stood between them and their enemies, like a mob to be shot down!' This 'engendered animosities and caused cruel retaliation'. As discussed in an earlier chapter, Alder notes that '[e]ven theory of [land] purchase was but another pretext to rob. We had no choice but to sell and take what they chose to give or be driven off and get nothing! The price offered was always governed by what it would cost to drive us off, and if the latter cost the least, it would always be the first resort'.¹ This is a striking contrast to narratives that emphasize ravaged white women, the torture stake and the scalping knife.

A number of narratives written by travellers made honest attempts to document their experience among the indigenous peoples, including their performances. One of these was the young Englishman Francis Baily, who toured the West Indies, the eastern seaboard, the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys, and the Wilderness Road. His narrative is one of the most extensive of any published from this period, with lots of detail and a style that leaves the reader with a strong sense of Baily's integrity. He went on to succeed on the London Stock Exchange as a broker and became a member of the Royal Society and a founder of the London Astronomical Society. His works on everything from insurance companies to astronomy were well regarded, and his travel narrative is a benchmark for even-handedness, given his limited knowledge of indigenous cultures.²

In the evening of 21 February in 1796, Baily and his 'Kentucky Boat' companions, most of whom were bound for the Ohio Territory and may have even eventually met Jonathan Alder at his farm overlooking the Big Miami valley, encountered a thunderstorm of an intensity unprecedented in their experience.³ Spying mysterious lights on the riverbank during the storm, they steered their flatboat in that direction. Upon closer observation, they found a group of people, painted black, dancing around a bonfire with torches in their hands and 'muttering some strange incoherent sounds' in solidarity with the thunderstorm. Both Baily's 'western' sensibilities and his desire to present a balanced account were tested in his efforts to describe the event. Perhaps because he was simply on a tour and not endeavouring to secure lands from the native peoples, he was able to detect the benign nature of the performance, even if he still did not really understand it:

Their peculiar appearance, whose effect was heightened by the contrast of the tempestuousness of the night, and the rolling of the thunder and lightning around us, put me in mind so much of the descriptions which are given of the infernal regions, that for the moment, I could not help considering them as so many imps let loose upon the earth to perform their midnight orgies; though it proved to be nothing more than

a few Indians, who, disturbed by the inclemency of the weather, could not sleep, and were innocently diverting themselves with singing and dancing round their fire.⁴

This description reflects the sensibilities of an English Christian, accustomed to experiencing religious rites in a church under very controlled circumstances. What Baily did not know is that to the indigenous people performing this ceremony, the elements of the storm were living forces – ‘other-than-human persons’ – that had to be acknowledged and appeased. However, in this performance that to him must have seemed macabre, he did detect an element of enjoyment, a quality that, given the season, likely reflected excitement about the prospect of spring’s return.

As A. Irving Hallowell noted in his studies of the Ojibwa, as in most Native American world views, the natural force of thunder manifested its image as the thunderbird. Like most birds, thunderbirds left for the winter and returned as the spring equinox approached. Their great power seemed obvious; as soon as they returned, the world began to renew itself and it was time to plant that year’s crop. Hibernating animals awoke, the days grew longer and the spring thunderstorm season arrived. Hallowell noted that in Ojibwa mythology, nine thunderbirds had married nine Ojibwa sisters, an ideal situation in that culture therefore the Ojibwa and the thunderbirds were related. He illustrates how seriously thunderbirds were regarded by relating a story from an informant who reported that while sitting in a tent with an elderly couple during a storm, the man asked his wife after a clap of thunder, ‘Did you hear what was said?’ To which the wife replied, ‘No, I didn’t catch it.’⁵ Indeed, one fundamental of an indigenous world view is the communication between human and ‘other-than-human persons’. It is worth mentioning that scientists who study the question of how ‘life’ initially began on earth believe that the electric currents of primordial storms were vital in that ‘genesis’. The separation from the other-than-human environment can be seen as a sort of hubris in which the Western tradition has conventionally placed itself ‘above’ a world in which it is embedded. But its own profound tool of understanding, science, seems to validate the indigenous view of a holistic world. ‘Western society’ cuts things up to study them, but we forget that the pieces are all connected. This is the fallacy of the ‘colonial’ world view.

Treaty performances in which Indian/White relations were ritually established continued after the American Revolution. The French had tried to win a ‘neutral belt’ for the Indians south of the Great Lakes at the Treaty of Paris talks in 1782, but failed.⁶ The first of these treaty ceremonies after the war was the second Treaty of Fort Stanwix in 1784. This was called because the Indians had not been invited to the Treaty of Paris negotiations, a fact that underscores the condescending view of the empire, be it British or American, toward the indigenous peoples. The victory of the ‘Long Knives’ (as the Indians called Euro-Americans)

was the worst-case scenario for most indigenous peoples in their long struggle against imperial aggression. No other empire was so bent on obtaining their lands, and the American attitude toward the Indians would be reflected in a new level of aggression.

At Fort Stanwix, US commissioners Arthur Lee of Virginia, Oliver Wolcott of Connecticut and Richard Butler of Pennsylvania saw the Indians as a conquered people. The British had been defeated, and the Indians allied with them, in the Americans' view, had lost their lands by right of conquest. Whatever lands they retained would be 'given' to them by the United States. The presence of 150 continental soldiers was designed to bring that message home, but as one witness recalled, these troops were unkempt and ill-fed. The fort itself was a ruin, with thorny vines and bushes overgrowing it. Commissioners stayed in leaky huts; blocked roads and burned out farmhouses in the area were not conducive to a feeling of peace and friendship. While the Confederation Congress had sent its commissioners on a peaceful mission, the attitudes of the US agents worked against this goal. Arthur Lee shared General George Rogers Clark's view that Indians were 'animals that must be subdued and kept in awe'.⁷

The split between the colonies-cum-states and the Confederation Congress of the United States became evident immediately. Before the performances began, New York agents were blocked from coming into the fort and sutlers⁸ selling alcohol to the Indians were banned from doing so, with one of them being arrested. When Lieutenant John Mercer confiscated the trader's alcohol, the Montgomery County Court issued a warrant for the Lieutenant's arrest. Adding a measure of credibility to the proceedings was the presence of the Marquis de Lafayette and St Pierre François de Barbé-Marbois, establishing the return of French influence to the region. Indeed, Lafayette asked that the Indians restore their old Covenant Chain they had with Onontio (the Indians' name for the French Empire in Canada) with their Euro-American brothers. But the fact that the British were still in their western forts, including nearby Oswego, along with the conflict between the Confederation and New York State, undermined American and French assertions of power.⁹

The next year the new republic set out to treat with the north-western tribes, almost none of whom had recognized the Six Nations' right to treat for them, a point of contention dating from the colonial period. This meeting took place in the dead of winter, 1785, at Fort McIntosh, an American fort constructed during the Revolution at the mouth of the Beaver River below Pittsburgh. It is instructive to note that while the supply officers nearly froze to death bringing provisions down the quickly-freezing Ohio River, nearly five hundred men, women and children from the Delaware, Wyandot, Ojibwa, Ohio Senecas and Ottawas came from as far away as several hundred miles for the meeting.

The Americans, still represented by Lee and Butler and now joined by George Rogers Clark – basically a group of Indian-haters – stuck to the decorum and ceremony expected by the natives. Like Fort Stanwix, they began their presentation by haranguing the Indians on their position of weakness, having been associated with the defeated British. They insisted that ‘because we claim the country by conquest ... you are to *give*, not to *receive*’. After ten days of performances and talks, the US commissioners announced that they would claim the lands north of the Ohio River that drained into that river from Pennsylvania to the Great Miami River in modern-day western Ohio. These 30,000,000 acres were seen by the commissioners as the spoils of war and they considered it generous that the Indians were ‘given’ a forty-mile-wide reserve along the shore of Lake Erie between the Cuyahoga and Maumee Rivers. The Indians retained the right to hunt on the new ‘federal’ land.¹⁰

At both of these treaty events, performances were undertaken as per the usual protocol. Condolence ceremonies opened the negotiations, and nightly dancing was performed after the Indian manner. For the Native Americans, these were as fundamental a part of the proceedings as the talks, and certainly more so than whatever written treaty might come afterward. *This* was the treaty – the Condolence, the speakers, the dancing; these would be the parts remembered by the Indians. For the whites, it was the piece of paper ratified by Congress that may or may not resemble the events of the ceremony. Indeed, when federal surveyors were following up on the white assumptions resulting from these treaty ceremonies in the autumn of 1786, they encountered the old Mingo leader Half-King. He told them that he could not allow the lands to be surveyed until he had consulted with the Wabash Indians who depended on the game there for their livelihoods. A point of confusion was raised as a result of the paternal attitude toward the Indians of men like Lee and Clark who used subtle and not-so-subtle bribes to gain treaty signatories. Because the Indian people knew that their representatives were often flattered or bribed at these events, the treaties were frequently invalidated by the villagers themselves, and this was certainly the case with the treaties of Forts Stanwix and McIntosh. In comparing the situation of the two sides, whites always had to get the treaties ratified by the Confederation Congress, later the Senate. In spite of the fact that Indian societies were often more democratic than that of Euro-Americans, it seems that whites did not consider the prospect that Native Americans may have some process for ratification of these treaties. Indeed, in this regard, race and class seemed to work together to deny, in the colonial mind, the possibility that treaty agreements had to be accepted by those who would have to abide by them. It was, after all, a very different situation to be ceding land than to be acquiring it. It seems strange that this has not been taken into consideration to a greater degree in historical interpretations. The relationship between, and conflation of, class and race in

American history is too frequently overlooked. A cultural analysis makes this hard to ignore.

The egalitarianism often discussed in regard to Euro-American culture in the US is, quite simply, overstated. While it is true that there were free white males who, regardless of class, had citizenship or the prospect of it, this 'egalitarianism' only works within an American 'pigmocracy', as Ira Berlin has phrased it, and skin colour was a kind of property right that could keep one off the 'bottom' of the social hierarchy.¹¹ The 'egalitarianism' to which some historians refer may be a functional concept within an ethnographic context of white, Anglo, mainstream society, but it does not include the intertwined realities of class and race.¹² Performances in the burgeoning cities of the new republic reveal this phenomenon. After all, it was from here that the culture of empire left for the frontier region, and performers on the frontier frequently travelled to these urban centres for both material and actors. It could also be argued that even New York, Philadelphia and the like were not far removed from the frontier in this early period.

Whether on the frontier or in the metropole, due to the need to rationalize an 'underclass' destined to be either displaced or to serve the white master, a process of dehumanization occurred, in part, through the vehicle of performance. These imagined 'Others' found their way out of the Euro-American mind and onto the stage, taking their place next to a parallel, romanticized white self-image. These creatures from the depths of the Euro-American psyche can be seen in the repertory of the most popular post-Revolution plays. Royall Tyler was a native of Boston, served in the revolutionary army, and studied law at Harvard. His play, *The Contrast*, was based on Richard Sheridan's *The School for Scandal* and is considered by theatre historians to be the first 'American' play. Adapting a stock play of the Empire to suit the myth-making needs of the new United States meant that *The Contrast* looked back to the bourgeois theatres of the British Empire on one hand, but it also looked ahead to the theatre of the early American white republic. First produced at the John Street Theatre in New York in April of 1787, it portrayed the 'contrast' between the Englishman and the American, and was the midwife of an Anglo-American creation – the 'Vanishing Indian'.¹³

This 'Vanishing Indian' can be seen at the beginning of Scene 2 in the play. Here, the female protagonist Maria sings the song 'Alknomook, the Death Song of the Cherokee Indians', which became quite popular in the early republic. The song represented a contrived indigenous acquiescence to Euro-American Empire:

The sun sets at night and the stars shun the day,
But glory remains when the light fades away.
Begin, ye tormentors, your threats are in vain,
For the son of Alknomook shall never complain.
Remember the arrows he shot from his bow;

Remember your chiefs by his hatchet laid low;
 Why so slow? do you wait till I shrink from my pain?
 No! the son of Alknomook shall never complain.
 Remember the wood where in ambush we lay,
 And the scalps which we bore from your nation away;
 Now the flame rises fast, you exult in my pain,
 But the son of Alknomook shall never complain.
 I'll go to the land where my father is gone;
 His ghost shall rejoice in the fame of his son;
 Death comes like a friend to relieve me from pain;
 And thy son, O Alknomook, has scorn'd to complain.

After singing the song, Maria observes that:

There is something in this song which ever calls forth my affections. The manly virtue of courage, that fortitude which steels the heart against the keenest misfortunes, which interweaves the laurel of glory amidst the instruments of torture and death, displays something so noble, so exalted, that in despite of the prejudices of education, I cannot but admire it, even in a savage.¹⁴

This song romanticized events on the frontier that were considerably more 'raw' than one would be given to believe from hearing the uncomplaining 'Alknomook'. When German physician Johann David Schoepf travelled through the United States in 1783–4, the Revolution was still very much in evidence. People were not yet much in the mood for formal performances, as they were still seen by most as frivolous if not corrupt expressions of British imperial culture.

Schoepf had done his research on the short history of the region and was familiar with the colonists' attack on a group of peaceful Moravian Indians that surpassed even the brutal actions of the Paxton Boys nineteen years earlier. Here, in 1782 on the Muskingham River in what is today north-east Ohio at the village of Gnadenhütten '53 grown men and women and 42 children' were killed by a band of militiamen from western Pennsylvania. This occurred when the perpetrators initially surrounded the Indians while they were making sugar from maple trees in the area. After agreeing to share their communal wine, the Indians were told by the militia that they would be taken to Pittsburgh where they would be safer. But after a meeting of the militiamen, led by one David Williamson, it was determined that the Indians would be killed the next day, and they were told this. They spent the night singing and praying and the next day were bound 'two by two', taken to two different houses, and murdered. This triggered another round of conflict between natives and colonials in the upper Ohio region.¹⁵

Also represented in *The Contrast* is the first, *positive* appearance – the English satge had previously presented a lampooned version – of a Euro-American backwoodsman in the person of Jonathan, who subsequently became become 'Brother Jonathan' of the nineteenth century American stage.¹⁶ Jonathan's latent

virtue is depicted in his Puritan-style republicanism, here appreciated but lampooned nonetheless. In this famous scene he has been to the theatre but thought he was looking in on 'the neighbour's living room'. The play he was watching was *The School for Scandal*:

Jonathan: [The theatre is] the devil's drawing room. Yes; why ain't cards and dice the devil's device; and the playhouse, the shop where the devil hangs out the vanities of the world, upon the tenterhooks of temptation. I believe you have not heard how they were acting the old boy one night, and the wicked one came among them sure enough; and went right off in a storm, and carried one quarter of the playhouse with him. Oh! No, no, no! You won't catch me at a playhouse, I warrant you.

Jenny: Well, Mr. Jonathan, you were certainly at the playhouse.

Jonathan: I at the playhouse! – Why didn't I see the play then?

Jenny: Why, the people you saw were the players.

Jonathan: Mercy on my soul! Did I see the wicked players? – Mayhap that 'ere Darby that I liked so, was the old serpent himself, and had his cloven foot in his pocket. Why, I vow, now I come to think on 't, the candles seemed to burn blue, and I am sure where I sat it smelt tarnally of brimstone.¹⁷

Jonathan's naiveté is both laughable and endearing. This 'virtuous rustic' resonated with a Euro-American population as theatre made its return to North America. As whites on the frontier were murdering native villagers and driving them off their own land, Jonathan represented a backwoodsman who was loveable in his simplicity. This is a striking contrast to the 'Jonathan' often seen by Native American villagers in the Ohio country.

New York theatre manager and playwright William Dunlap thought the play deficient in 'plot, dialogue, or incident', but also referred to it as the moment when the American drama off the stage united with the American drama on the stage.¹⁸ While this play did, to some extent, represent a Euro-American perception of indigenous people, slaves were not represented. How were they to be treated in this new political arrangement?¹⁹ Dunlap was an abolitionist, a fairly rare bird during this period but, like most abolitionists in the early republic, he was also a supporter of African colonization – the returning of freed slaves to Africa.²⁰ 'Blackening up' – whites performing in blackface – was nothing new to the stage. Actors often played Othello in blackface, as well as the Harlequin, who had been a stock character since the medieval era.²¹ But these types of performances raised Dunlap's greatest fear: theatre put into 'the hands of any person, whose sole aim is profit (either by making money or increasing his professional celebrity)'. If the manager, Dunlap wrote, must please the public, the public becomes pleased only by 'glitter, parade, false sentiment, and all that lulls conscience or excites to evil'.²² Hero worship of military commanders, nation-building at the expense of 'vanishing' Indians, and 'happy darkies' were

ascendant. Dunlap's desire to meld the pre-revolutionary 'polite' or 'legitimate' theatre with republican virtue was a hard sell. The lack of subsidies and the need to pay the expenses of a theatre striving for legitimacy in the Atlantic cultural world would increasingly force theatre managers to compromise on quality and present material designed to bring in receipts. Popular views of race, class and gender overshadowed nuanced realism.

A well-known play that treats race and class together is George Coleman's *Inkle and Yarico: An Opera*, which was borrowed from a story printed in an early volume of the English theatre publication, *The Spectator*. It ostensibly adheres to the radical Whig sensibility, 'exhibiting a picture of that heartless cupidity which too often characterizes the sons of commerce, who care little for human liberty and happiness, if they chance to obstruct them in their eager pursuit of wealth.'²³ But it is the play's popularity and its treatment of non-whites that makes it most pertinent to the culture of empire in North America. The play was originally performed at London's Haymarket Theatre in 1787 and became a stock play on both sides of the Atlantic. *Inkle and Yarico* presents a pair of English travellers, Inkle and his trusted footman Trudge, who are abandoned by their shipmates to a seemingly horrific fate at the hands of the American 'savages'. Before that abandonment, Inkle is surveying the land and deducing the myriad ways one could financially benefit in the New World. Inkle submits his calculations to his Uncle Medium who is less of an entrepreneur than he:

Travelling was always intended for improvement; and improvement is an advantage; and an advantage is a profit; and profit is gain. Which in the travelling translation of a trader, means that you should gain every advantage of improving your profit.²⁴

The three are bound for Barbados, where Inkle is to marry Governor Christopher Curry's daughter, Narcissa – another calculation, contrived by 'the old folks,' according to Inkle. While stopped at an island still controlled by the natives, Medium asks him why he is calculating and 'hunting old hairy negroes' – a characteristic conflation of Native Americans and Africans – when he should be 'ogling a fine girl in the ship?' Inkle replies that the marriage is 'a table of interest, from beginning to end'. After pondering aloud how much the natives might fetch at West Indian markets, the three find themselves pursued by the 'savages'. Trudge also wishes he was back at his desk 'scribbling away an old parchment! – But all my red ink will be spilt by an old black pin of a negro'. But while Inkle and Trudge hide in a clump of trees, Medium makes it back to the ship, which sails post-haste, leaving Inkle and Trudge to their fate.²⁵

In seeking shelter from the 'savages', the pair enters a cave where they find the Indian maidens Yarico and Wowski asleep in their lair. Yarico awakens and immediately reveals to the audience her lot in life with a song:

When the close of the day is done, And the shaggy lion's skin,
Which, forces or warrior's win, Deck our cells, at set of sun;
Worn with toil, with sleep opprest; I press my mossy bed, and sink to rest.
Then once more, I see our train, with all our chace renew'd again,
Once more, tis day, one more, our prey, Gnashes his angry teeth, and foams
in vain.

Again, in sullen haste, he flies, Ta'en in the toil, again he lies;
Again he roars – and, in my slumbers, dies.²⁶

The song reflects an imperial view of indigenous life – widely held well into the twentieth century – that suggests native peoples lived in endless drudgery which, the implication is, could only be overcome by embracing 'civilization' and adopting the white man's ways. Or, put another way, it provides justification for destroying their way of life.

Yarico then sees Inkle and the two fall desperately in love. She speaks perfect English, unlike her maid, apparently indicating the class structure of the 'savages'. Inkle is pleased by her wild beauty, she by his fair skin. They sing a duet, and when Inkle asks if she would regret leaving her 'grot' behind, she replies, 'Ah, no, I could follow, and sail the world over, / Nor think of my grot when I look at my lover!'²⁷ When Trudge observes the mutual attraction, being the loyal footman, he cries, 'Oho! It's time, I see, to begin making interest with the chambermaid!'²⁸ This conflation of Trudge with Inkle is consistent throughout the play – Inkle never speaks in first person plural, always in the singular. What is good for Inkle is good for Trudge.

For her part, Wowski maintains the proper class structure with her broken English, saying 'iss' for 'yes', for example. What English she knows, she tells Trudge, she learned from a strange man that had 'tumbled from a big boat, many moons ago'. But she acknowledges that Trudge can still 'Teach me - Teach good many'. In a curious reversal of the 'Columbian Exchange'²⁹ Wowski says that she also learned to smoke tobacco from this same white man: 'Teach me put dry grass, red hot, in hollow white stick ... Put in my mouth – go poff, poff?'³⁰ And, Trudge asks, what became of this man? 'Eat him one day – Our chief kill him'. Wowski then sings a song that portrays the indigenous maiden's need and desire for the white man:

White man never go away – Tell me why need you?
Stay with your Wowski, stay: Wowski will feed you.
Cold moons are now coming in: Ah, don't go grieve me!
I'll wrap you in leopard's skin: White man, don't leave me.
And when all the sky is blue, Sun makes warm weather,
I'll catch you a cockatoo, Dress you in feather ...
When cold comes, or when 'tis hot, Ah don't go grieve me!
Poor Wowski will be forgot – White man don't leave me!³¹

So the indigenous peoples of the Caribbean, especially the women it is implied, craved rescue by the white man.

Eventually, the four hale a passing ship and make their way to Barbados, where Inkle's reluctant intended, Narcissa, has rekindled an old flame between herself and one Captain Campley. Inkle, pondering the fortune that awaits him through his arranged marriage with Narcissa, reluctantly decides to sell Yarico into slavery, although he wants to ensure that a benevolent owner buys her. Inkle and Narcissa's father had never met. Before Inkle's arrival, Narcissa had led her father to believe that Campley was Inkle and Curry had therefore given his blessing to a marriage between Campley and Narcissa. Curry leaves the wedding before it is over to 'gather himself', and is approached by Inkle at the wharf who (the pair having never met) asks Curry if he would like to purchase Yarico. At this point, Inkle and Yarico have subjected the audience to no small quantity of impassioned promises of undying love and fidelity between them. In the *dénouement*, the truth comes out; Inkle is seen by all concerned, including himself, to be a picture of 'heartless cupidity'. He then repents of his harsh ways and promises to stay with Yarico forever – something which, oddly, she still desires.

There are numerous assumptions and representations in this play that fed audiences' self-image as purveyors of benevolent empire. That an Indian/Negro princess and her 'chambermaid' would sacrifice all to live on a British sugar island among strangers in a strange land indicates not so much the power of love as the alleged wretched conditions in which they lived. The white man who had taught English and the fine art of tobacco use to them had also made them aware of those conditions, kindling their desire for a better life. Whether Inkle and Trudge, not to mention Barbados, were up to the challenge is arguable.

Richard Steele's original version of the story has a very different ending. Upon arriving in the 'English Territories', Inkle has begun to reflect on the time and money that Yarico has cost him. In the end, he sells Yarico to a Barbadian merchant in spite of the fact that she has told him she is bearing his child.³² Departing from the Steele, the final tableau of the Colman version depicts Inkle's remorse and reunion with the Indian/Negro Yarico. As the actress and commentator Elizabeth Inchbald pointed out in the 1808 publication, the moral lesson here is in regard to the cupidity of commerce, especially commerce in human beings.³³ Parliament abolished the African slave trade in the Empire in 1807, the year before this particular publication of the play. Its opening in 1787, the year the United States debated a Constitution that included twenty-year sunset clause on the African slave trade, puts it in a vein of awakening sensitivity to the brutalities of slavery that occurred during the 'Age of Revolution'. In most of the Atlantic world, this sensitivity increased in the nineteenth century. In the American South however, slavery expanded and the moment of clarity regarding slavery passed, creating more demand for rationale on the theatre stage. But

even among those opposed to the slave trade or even slavery, the construction of this mythos maintains that these Afro-Indian hybrids were no equals to the Anglo-Saxon.

A variant of Dunlap's sentiments regarding the corrupting force of profit on the theatre can be seen as far away as Charleston, South Carolina. Writing under the pen name 'Civis' in January 1786, one individual expressed an interest in opening a new theatre but that the corrupt works of English playwrights were unworthy of the new nation. If legislators could utilize their

[M]anifold avocations [to] undertake the superintendence of the pieces to be performed before they should be presented to the public, all difficulties would be at an end ... The morals and manners of this country are too chaste to leave reason to apprehend than any improper plays will be written here for perhaps centuries to come.³⁴

While Charleston's theatre scene largely followed that of the sugar islands and other southern colonies before the Revolution, the war changed all that. Recall that South Carolina was the only state other than Delaware south of the Mason-Dixon Line to vote for the Congressional injunction against theatre in 1778.³⁵ After the war, numerous plays written by Charlestonians were presented, including some that seem to fit the pattern in New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Annapolis and elsewhere. Examples include *The 28th of June, or, The Attack on Fort Moultrie*; *America Preserved, or, the Americans and French at the Siege of Yorktown*; and *Americana, or, A Tale of the Genii*.³⁶ *The 28th of June* was a locally written play with an *Ode* written by a Mrs Marriott. It was first performed in the French Theatre by Alexander Placide's troupe in 1794 on the anniversary of the occasion and again on 4 July. The play was written in honour of General William Moultrie's spirited defence of Fort Sullivan (later renamed in his honour) in June 1776 that invigorated the patriot cause in the South. While the secondary literature shows no record of it, it is probable that General Moultrie, recently retired from public life as a member of Congress from South Carolina, was in attendance.³⁷ *America Preserved* was a recreation of the Yorktown battle after the growing demand for such re-enactments on the stage. *Americana* circulated throughout the eastern seaboard and was actually rediscovered and reproduced in New York in 1985.³⁸ It was a re-enactment play and can be counted among the early melodramatic works written and produced in America. All of these plays fall into a subgenre of battle re-enactments that reflect a heightened interest on both sides of the Atlantic – because of their ability to fill seats – in large-scale militaristic productions.³⁹ There can be little doubt of this work's role in perpetuating an imperial mythos.

In New York, while Dunlap warned of the problems inherent in combining market economics with the theatre, he was at the mercy of those forces himself. His dilemma was that of coming up with fresh material that would be artisti-

cally satisfying and still draw audiences in Dunlap and other theatre managers dealt with this in a variety of ways. One play, *The Poor Soldier*, featured Thomas Wignell in one of his most popular roles as an Irish soldier named 'Darby'. Wignell requested something new for Darby, an interlude perhaps, where Darby would return to Ireland after his adventures in the King's army. As a result, Dunlap wrote *Darby's Return*, one of the early sequels on the American stage. True to form, Dunlap made Darby into an American Cincinnatus that embodied republican virtue and proved very popular, being published numerous times. In 1789, the play was performed with George Washington himself in attendance. In a particularly rich historical moment, the character of a humble, rural, republican-minded Irish soldier spoke words reminiscent of the much-championed Roman republican Cincinnatus, historicized for the new republic in the physical and mythical person of General Washington who was watching the performance from a box seat:

A man who fought to free the land from woe,
Like me, had left his farm, a-soldiering to go;
 But having gain'd his point, he had, *like me*,
 Return'd his own potato ground to see.
 But there he could not rest. With one accord
 He's called to be a kind - not a lord -
 I don't know what, he's not a *great man*, sure,
 For poor men love him just as he were poor,
 The love like a father or a brother.⁴⁰

To which 'Dermot' replies: 'As we poor Irishmen love one another'⁴¹. Here was a conflation of republican virtue with democratic solidarity – a conflation from Dunlap's soul with an eye toward drawing the artisan democrat-republicans of New York to his theatre. Darby claimed that he never got to see General Washington because he had mistaken him for a man that was 'all lace and glitter, botherum and shine'⁴². To which Washington reportedly unloosed a hearty laugh – a moment of glory for the young playwright/manager Dunlap.

An analysis of this passage reveals two levels of myth-making and rationale for empire-building. First, there is the projection of a democratic ideal onto those who were perceived as perhaps the most humble white men of the day and the lowest ranking group allowed into the fold by virtue of their skin colour and familiarity: the Irish. Then there is the worship of the new nation's virtue epitomized in the ideal republican: Washington.⁴³ It was heretofore a rare moment, revealing the great hopes many had that this new political entity would manifest the long-held dreams of humanity, understood to mean white Euro-Americans. As Dunlap frequently stated, the stage was a 'great engine' of virtue or of vice. However democratic white Americans perceived themselves to be, the vast majority of them ultimately turned to an owner of slaves and a member of a

landed elite not only for leadership, but for projecting a nearly god-like reverence reminiscent of a child's view of his father. Ultimately, the non-white were excluded from the democratic club of citizenship, seen as inferior and in the case of indigenous peoples objects of conquest: 'Vanishing Indians'.

James K. Paulding, writing in the *American Quarterly Review* some forty years later and referenced by Dunlap in his *History*, observed that the 'national drama' (i.e., theatre), was one that appealed directly to national feeling:

[F]ounded upon domestic incidents – illustrating or satirizing domestic manners, and above all, displaying a generous chivalry in the maintenance and vindication of those great and illustrious peculiarities of situation and character by which we are distinguished from all other nations. We do not hesitate to say that next to the interests of eternal truth, there is no object more worthy the exercise of the highest attributes of mind than that of administering to the just pride of national character, inspiring a feeling for national glory, and inculcating a love of country.⁴⁴

One could also say that nationalistic – even jingoistic – propaganda that attuned the population to 'empire raising' was not only desirous to further the goals of an economic empire, but would allow those doing it to feel good about it.

This appeal to nationalistic sentiment would be aided by the arrival to New York in 1792 of one of the famed Kemble family of England, sister of the beloved Mrs (Sarah) Siddons – Mrs (Anne Julia Kemble) Hatton. Mrs Hatton soon had a new play called *The Songs of Tammany, or, the Indian Chief: A Serious Opera*, and was looking for someone to bring it to the stage. Mrs Hatton had already had a chequered career as a 'model' in a London bagnio (brothel), had unknowingly married a bigamist (one C. Curtis), and survived a gunshot to the face which apparently caused no great disfigurement. She was reportedly overweight, lame, had a squint and had been scarred by smallpox. As a result, her own stage appearances had been limited largely to the provinces. Her second marriage to William Hatton, an instrument-maker, had a stabilizing effect, and her penchant for gothic melodrama proved timely as the popularity of the genre was on the rise.⁴⁵ Dunlap cynically noted that Mrs Hatton 'kindly came to instruct us in the history of the country, the value of liberty and the duties of the patriot.'⁴⁶ It played to good houses in March and April of 1794. But apparently its quality left something to be desired as Dunlap referred to it as a 'tissue of bombast'.⁴⁷ Dunlap's disdain probably stemmed from the fact that Mrs Hatton had presented the play to the local Tammany Society, who endorsed it and recommended it to John Hodgkinson, the popular English actor who had also recently arrived. With Hodgkinson on their side, Dunlap noted that no manager could have rejected something from the Sons of St Tammany.⁴⁸

Almost all of the music and script are lost; all that remains are lyrics to the dozen or so songs in the play.⁴⁹ But these lyrics provide insight into the culture that championed this play as well as supporting the claim that theatre was a vehi-

cle for rationalizing and assuaging the brutal excesses of the expanding economic empire. The two main characters in the play are Tammany and his wife Manana. While we cannot know the exact dialogue, the songs do provide a rough guide to such plot developments as there were. The first two songs are a song to the sun and a song to the woods sung by Manana. The third song praises the sweetness of nature, but proclaims the sweetness of Tammany to be greater still. She then sings of the glory of Tammany's hunting and warring skills. Portrayed essentially as children, a 'Chorus of Indians' sing of victory in battle near 'Or'noco's limpid stream', which continues:

Late our chiefs were stain'd with blood;
War resounded thro' the wood;
Now the battles din is o'er;
Fury swells our souls no more;
Now we laugh and dance and play;
Happy Indians; come away.⁵⁰

The refrain 'Happy Indians' is repeated several times in this and the next song. The British often referred to the colonists as wayward children, and the cultural core of the splinter empire now viewed Indians and for that matter whites living in the West to be children who should obey their wise father. The dichotomy of wise parent (Britain or the post-Constitution Federalist government), and unruly child (Indians, frontiersmen, yeomen farmers, artisans), became an institutionalized construction in the Federalist period.⁵¹

The play opened in a political climate polarized by such dialectic thinking and 'St. Tammany's friends' planned a ruse intended to bring in receipts. A rumour circulated that a group was planning to hiss the play, and 'the poorer class of mechanics and clerks and bankrupt people who should be content with the mischief they had already done, and who might be much better employed than in disturbing a theatre',⁵² arrived to protect the Saint's dignity. The only disturbance reported was one directed at the leader of the orchestra, James Hewitt, who also composed the music for the play, for not having a popular air ready to hand when it was demanded, a behavioural trend that would only increase.⁵³ For his part, Dunlap did not appreciate being manipulated, whether it was by the audience or by 'over mighty' star actors like John Hodgkinson.

While Mrs Hatton's play was not considered a work of sophistication, it was applauded by the mechanics and artisans of the early republic. Tammany was a Delaware leader who had negotiated a couple of treaties with William Penn in the late seventeenth century. The Schuylkill Fishing Company of Philadelphia had adopted him as their patron saint, since they argued that these treaties had given them fishing rights to the river. The Tammany figure represents the first widespread and sustained conflation of Euro-American with indigenous

American identities.⁵⁴ A bit of drinking helped cement the union – the Indian character Wegaw sings a song called ‘For deep sups of this Liquor I swear’, that continues:

Have made foolish Wegaw quite wise,
 And faith now, I can tell to a hair,
 What’s doing above in the skies.
 The sun is a deep-thinking fellow,
 He dries up the dews of the night,
 Lest old father Time should get mellow,
 And so become slow in his flight.
 The moon she loves drinking, ’tis plain,
 She governs the tides of each flood,
 And oft takes a sip from the main;
 You may know by her changeable mood.
 Thou dear tippling orb give me drink,
 Large lakes full of glorious rum!
 My head turns, I’m swimming I think –
 Sweet Rhema! Why look you so glum?⁵⁵

This pokes fun at the image of an inferior and childlike alcoholic Indian while revealing the pathos inherent in alcoholism. The first of these would appeal to those who might identify with such a state of drunkenness; the second would be recognizable to the more sober and calculating in the audience. Not only was alcohol profitable to frontier traders, it devastated the social structure of Indian societies, weakening them profoundly.

Apparently, the Spanish had a significant role in this play – a character named ‘Ferdinand’ sings a song for Manana while Tammany is away. He refers to her as a ‘sweet simple maid’ whom ‘the white man loves, pray believe me’. Manana and Tammany then separately together have a sense of foreboding and war. Tammany senses problems with Manana and vows revenge if she is harmed. Manana bemoans the return of violence, ‘war spreads his flaming brands around.’⁵⁶ Using the tune of ‘Alknomook, The Death Song of the Cherokee Indians’, the popular song in *The Contrast*, Tammany then, for the first time in the play, condemns the white invaders:

The sun sets in night and the stars shun the day,
 But glory unfading can never decay,
 You white men deceivers your smiles are in vain;
 The son of Alkmoonac, shall ne’er wear your chains.

To which, Manana adds:

To land where our fathers are gone we will go,
 Where grief never enters but pleasures still flow,

Death comes like a friend: he relieves us from pain,
Thy children, Alkmoonac, shal ne'er wear their chain.

Then both sing:

Farewell then ye woods which have witnessed our shame
Let time on his wings hear our record of fame.
Together we die for our spirits disdain,
Ye white children of Europe your rankling chain.⁵⁷

In other words, they willingly depart the world, leaving North America to the European invaders. But this is too dark of a tone to set the mood for a post-Indian America. The next song begins to assuage the negative feelings that may have arisen:

Now let's forget each woe that's past
Mirth, joy and peace are ours at last.
To jocund measures let us move,
By the bright moon-beams in the grove,
Hither haste with frolic gay,
Sons of India: haste away.

Chorus

Sorrow no more with us is found;
Peace, joy and frolic, mirth resound;
While ev'ry wood and ev'ry grove,
Echoes the melting song of love'.
Hither haste with frolic gay,
Sons of India: haste away.

Here commences an extended song singing the praises of Tammany and Manana, their bravery and virtue, by Indian priests and Spaniards together. With that, the inevitable ethnic cleansing is again resumed, albeit somewhat tempered by humble respect for the vanquished:

While we rear the standard high,
Weep upon our victory.
Let fame her clarion sound,
To the list'ning world proclaim,
Throughout all her ample round,
Laurel'd conquest and bright fame,
Yet let humanity still fervid glow,
Showing soft mercy to the vanquish'd foe.⁵⁸

As sad as it may be, this song bemoans, the Indians must go.

This was a theme in the national mythos of this scion of the British Empire. It is interesting to note what John Adams, one of the leaders of the revolution and

second president of the United States, remembered most when recalling those days of 'Indian scalplings' which were now part of life in the West:

I in my boyish Rambles used to call at their Wigwam, where I never failed to be treated with Whortle Berries, Blackberries, Strawberries or Apples, Plumbs Peaches, etc., for they had planted a variety of fruit Trees about them.⁵⁹

But, according to the mythic construction that *Inkle and Yarico* implies, the brave and virtuous American yeoman and mechanic will be here to perpetuate the memory and glory of the likes of Tammany and Manana. Indeed, the 'Sons of Tammany' had essentially brought the play to the stage. The populist appeal of the play to the mechanics and artisans of New York was rooted in the conflation of Euro-American working class republican values with the 'Noble Savage' of North America. As this ethnicity was being 'cleansed' from the cultural geography of the continent, the Sons of Tammany would see to it that their virtue would live on in the artisan culture of the new republic. This would be familiar theme well into the nineteenth century. Dunlap, and his compatriots in Boston, Philadelphia, Annapolis, and Charleston, bit their tongues and sold tickets to audiences wanting to see the culture of empire validate the national project.

Another example of creating the mythology of American empire can be found in 1797, when a recently-arrived Irishman by the name of John Daly Burk saw his play *Bunker-Hill, or, The Death of General Warren* performed at the newly-opened Haymarket Theatre in Boston. Plays depicting the deaths of generals were a standard feature of the culture of empire – General Joseph Warren had died at the Battle of Breed's Hill, more commonly known as Bunker's Hill. When he was killed, his commission as General was not yet in effect so he volunteered to serve in General Israel Putnam's army as a private, although he was a commander in the battle. Killed by a ball to the head, his death made him a martyr in the view of the continentals, and a John Trumbull painting captured the sentiment.

The success of the play reinforced for theatre managers the fact that their audiences wanted to see the 'glories' of the Revolution reflected on the stage now that the horrors were beginning to fade. Burk was impassioned by the revolution brewing in his own homeland, and expressed his anti-British sympathies through this play. The Haymarket Theatre had been opened in response to the perceived lack of republican sentiment represented on the stage of manager John B. Williamson's Federal Street Theatre. Williamson, responding to Burk's play, described it as a 'tragedy, the most execrable of the Grub Street kind',⁶⁰ brought about by the rage for novelty and an appeal to the 'Jacobin spirit in the lower ranks'. Dunlap, whose politics remained obscure to the end of his life, called it 'deplorable' and was 'sorry to say it was afterwards played in New-York'.⁶¹ Burk had written much of the play on the passage from Ireland to America and the

fresh republican spirit of revolution from Ireland rekindled similar sentiments in American audiences.⁶²

The analysis that typically accompanies the theatre fare of the early republic has to do with creating nationalism, or the federal and anti-federal split in the political culture. But what is infrequently remembered is that the performances on the Euro-American side of the frontier, from which these eastern towns are not far removed, were all expressions of colonialism and empire. Indeed those who were of the republican persuasion, followers for the most part of Thomas Jefferson, were some of the most viral Indian-haters in the West and strongest advocates for slavery in the South. Indeed, while Jefferson represented a more democratic point of view than John Adams or certainly Alexander Hamilton, people were expected to submit to the government they created. Indian social groups were small, autonomous and egalitarian. The idea that individuals had the right to simply break off and start another village if they found themselves at odds with decisions made by tribal leaders was inherent in most indigenous societies. Jefferson, who had fond and even profound memories of the Indians he had known as a child in Virginia, understood that the presence of the European forces empire required the creation of an empire to resist them. Joining in a common refrain from white commentators, Jefferson was also very critical of the way Indian men treated women.⁶³ This criticism reflects a lack of knowledge of the indigenous culture from the inside. True, women did more work in indigenous societies than bourgeois women in colonial/imperial societies, but probably not more than working class women, and certainly they had more say in tribal affairs than their white counterparts. Both the lack of insider knowledge among the early American ruling class and this paradox of nation state and imperial expansion are defining attributes of these creations in the Age of Revolution and beyond.

That the American Revolution had been an Atlantic world phenomenon and not just an American one can be readily seen from Burk's play. The popularity of this republican sentimentalism reveals the assumptions of people who had survived a prolonged war that was ultimately fought for the democratization of the Atlantic economic empire. The secular 'hellfire and brimstone' that characterized the 'Prologue' harkens back to Oliver Goldsmith's recommendation that actors should adopt the 'enthusiasm' that was sweeping the Empire during the 'Great Awakening'. 'Enthusiasm' in the employ of what amounts to a propagandist for the republican empire on a theatre stage is revealing enough to include in its entirety:

When o'er Columbia's fields in fearful hour,
Glared the red Comet of Britannia's power,
From horrid hair shook flakes of burning wrath.
And war and desolation mark'd its path:

Rous'd by the fury of her ruthless foes,
 The angry Genius of Columbia rose:
 There, with a voice more loud, more deep than fate,
 Was rent the fabric of monarchic State,
 And instantaneous, soothing as the lyre,
 Which wakes the soul and kindles soft desire,
 She called the *great Republic* into day,
 And to a world, restored its legal sway:
 Behold; her patriot band the low lands fills
 Like to the torrents of a thousand hills,
 Which thund'ring to the plain their waters roll,
 Unite, condense, and form a mighty whole;
 Columbia's Sons down Allegheny's sides
 Their fiery cohorts pour in rapid tides:
 Whilst o'er the glassy surface of the flood,
 Light'd by the Sun, a gallant vessel rode;
 The Ark which bears the charter of the land
 It sail'd directed by the Almighty hand:
 'Till safe at length from tempest and from flood,
 Secure on freedom's Ararat it stood.
 Thus did this great, this glorious Empire rise,
 Which lifts its patriot honors to the skies;
 Spite of the bloody lash, the tyrant's frown,
 The shock of armies and a fleet's renown.
 A nobler theme than this, to grace the stage,
 Where can we find in all th' historic page?
 Of Rome's and Cato's fall, the World has rung:
 Why not Columbia's rising fame be sung?
 If Rome her Brutus and her Cato boast;
 Her Washington and Warren, each a host,
 Columbia owns; with thousand names beside.
 The least of which would swell the Roman pride:
 And midst these themes sublime, these subjects grand
 Which tempt the poet's fancy in this land,
 Where is there one more potent to inspire
 Conceptions vast, and wake Parnassian fire,
 Than when on Bunker's top a glorious hand
 Pour'd out their sacred blood to save the land?
 And ere they fell, such fierce destruction hurl'd;
 As when Volcanoes burn and tear the world.
 Such is our Bard's excuse that he this night
 Renews the horrors of fam'd Bunker's fight,
 And, bending suppliant at your awful shrine,
 His Child to your protection doth consign:
 Assur'd of Justice, he has dar'd to trace,
Columbia's Glories to *Columbia's* race.⁶⁴

This 'blood and thunder' employs a great flood of clichés from Judeo-Christian, Greco-Roman discourse. Captured in this prologue, and in the play itself, is the audience's need to have the character and motivations of the new republic couched in a virtuousness of biblical dimensions. The conflation of the US with 'Ararat' and Rome, the historicizing of Cato in the figures of Washington and Warren – the latter assumes a Christ-like significance in his martyrdom in the play – represent a proto-Manifest Destiny. The democratization of empire, as experienced by mainstream white America, is represented by and embodied in works like *Bunker-Hill*. That is, the martyrdom of the fallen began with the earliest conflicts between the English colonists and the American Indians in their successful efforts to usurp the Indians' land base. This performance, though it is of the 'execrable Grub Street kind', transfers this same kind of martyrdom to the revolutionary generation.

Burk's play was first presented at the Haymarket Theatre in Boston, which was set up by contributions from the city's working class mechanics who perceived the need for a theatre that presented entertainments in opposition to the Federal Theatre, thought by many to be controlled by Federalist politicians. Charles Stuart Powell had made arrangements to sell shares to build a republican theatre. He travelled to Europe to recruit a cast and, on the day after Christmas 1796, opened the Haymarket.⁶⁵ It was an immense wooden structure that was visible above all the other buildings in the city. Ginger Strand has illustrated the political differences that can be seen in the two plays, *Gustavas Vasa* and *Bunker-Hill*.⁶⁶ Here the latter presents General Warren as a martyr for the republican cause, the former presents an elite posing as one of the 'mob' and allowing his mother, sister and lover to die rather than surrender himself to tyranny. Radical republicans might have observed that it was just like a Federalist to let someone else die for your beliefs. In any case, on 17 February 1797, *Bunker-Hill* debuted at the Haymarket.⁶⁷

Burk's play features two main characters, both of whom die in the play. One is martyred and the other is depicted as a victim of his own misplaced allegiance to the British. General Warren is, of course, the martyr who dies for the cause of republicanism although it is a relatively short time from the moment when he must decide whether or not to defect to the patriot cause and when he is killed in the battle. The other is a British soldier named Abercrombie who is in love with Elvira – the Euro-American daughter of a North Carolina planter. Burk forces him to choose between misplaced honour (loyalty to the King), and Elvira. He chooses the former, which leads directly to his demise and Elvira's despair. The play's verse is wooden, but the reproduction of the battle itself was guaranteed to get the heart pumping and bring in the receipts, which gave it a vibrant and long life – it was a perennial favourite on 4 July and 25 November (Evacuation Day) – well into the nineteenth century.

Burk sent the script to Dunlap with instructions for executing the battle scene and an offer to sell him the right to 'get up' the play in New York.⁶⁸ Dunlap declined, but John Joseph Leger Solee, the Charleston theatre manager who had brought his troupe north in the summer to test the waters, was interested.⁶⁹ He tried to open the Southwark Theatre in Philadelphia in August 1797 but was prevented by a recurrence of yellow fever, a perennial hazard south of New England. He did, however, receive permission to use the decaying theatre on John Street in New York, and Dunlap witnessed 'all the smoke, noise, and nonsense, belonging to Mr. John Burk's muse'.⁷⁰

While Dunlap was not impressed by Burk's play, he was impressed by the receipts enough to produce his own version of a similar play. First drafted as *André* and later revised as *The Glory of Columbia: Her Yeomanry!*, Dunlap used this play and other similar original works for those occasions where the audience expected a representation of American nationalistic sentiment from the theatre stage. Dunlap had revised *André* because of a particular scene where the imminent hanging of the popular actor and scene painter, who also happened to be a British major and accomplice in the betrayal of the hated Benedict Arnold, was protested by an American soldier. This fictional soldier had worked with the Major at the Southwark Theatre in Philadelphia and the two were very close. Dunlap's distaste for the execution of the talented André was not shared by audiences and when the character of an American soldier tore the patriot cockade from his hat after his futile efforts to prevent André's execution, the audience reacted negatively – so negatively that Dunlap had to go onstage himself to apologize for and explain the scene to calm the audience. In the end, there was no cockade tearing in *The Glory of Columbia*, but the author's disdain for André's execution still comes across. While the verse is more subtle and sophisticated than that of Burk's play, Dunlap was not fond of the piece or the way it continued to be 'occasionally murdered for the amusement of holiday fools'.⁷¹ But it drew a crowd.

Like *Bunker-Hill*, *Columbia* contained mythic messages that the playwright knew would resonate with the audience. For example, the character of David Williams is basically a Brother Jonathan as a Patriot soldier with overtones of Cincinnatus and Cato. In Act I, Scene 2, Dunlap has Williams, who just extracted himself from being General Arnold's *aide-de-camp*, say:

So I be free from brushing coats and blacking boots! Dang it, pretty employment for a soldier! I be nation glad to part from the general; for certain he is changed dreadfully since I took him to serve him. Now 'fore I turn into the ranks again, I'll go and see how old father do, and Sal, and the pigs, and the cow; then back again and shoulder my gun till no color is seen this side the water but blue.⁷²

And later, addressing his sister Sal: '[T]ake care of father and the cows; and the children and pigs and rest of the live stock.'⁷³ These were the early years of the republican empire that starred the white yeoman farmer, a demographic that was by far in the majority and who, along with artisans and mechanics, was increasingly attracted to the theatres, particularly when they began to be constructed west of the Alleghenies.

Like Jonathan, Williams wears his virtue on his sleeve. This is seen in the following passage when Major John André, the same André who had helped organize the 'Mischianza' in Philadelphia, caught by Williams and his compatriots behind the American's lines after his secret meeting with Arnold, attempts to bribe them and Williams responds:

Why I tell you what, mister, likely there is more in that there purse, than father's farm's worth stuck and all: but somehow or other there is a sort of something here [pointing to his breast] that we Yankees don't choose to truck for money.⁷⁴

André 'demonstrates' his compromised virtue after being escorted to General Washington by Williams and friends, (he is on the wrong side, after all), in a similarly unsubtle fashion:

Tis well: you have taught me to reverence an American farmer. You have given me a convincing proof, that it is not high attainments, or distinguished rank, which ensure virtue, but rather early habits, and moderate desires. You have not only captured – you have *conquered* me (*italics in original*).⁷⁵

Dunlap injects some levity into the proceedings, which are otherwise somewhat wrenching (i.e., men about to be executed and their loved ones pleading for their lives intermingling with the perceived glory and necessity of dying and killing for a noble cause). This takes form in the Irishman, Dennis O'Bogg – another ethnic character that has great traction on the American (and English) stage. O'Bogg deserts the British army to join with the Americans, ostensibly to escape his two wives – a situation which he describes in convoluted monologues regarding his implied sexual prowess. One song he sings concludes:

The frenchman gay with his louis d'or,
The solemn don, and the soft signor,
The dutch mynheer, so full of pride,
The russian, prussian, swede beside;
They all may do whate're they can
But they'll never love like an Irishman.⁷⁶

While the Irishman would eventually lose much of his republican era stature, he was, in these instances, portrayed as hard-drinking, hard-living, but basically virtuous republican. The Irish were, after all, enemies of the British and had fought

in the continental army, and republicanism had a decidedly pro-French, pro-Irish bent. The Irish and especially the Scots-Irish were instrumental in the frontier Indian wars, demonstrating a virulent form Indian-hating that would characterize the frontier of North American empire through the nineteenth century.

Indeed, Scots-Irish, German-American and Euro-American settlers in the West had lost family members to Indian retaliations for their own lost relatives as well as encroachment on lands they considered theirs. These 'frontiersmen' often followed their own interest *vis-à-vis* national and imperial interests which they deemed less important if not corrupt and tyrannical. Like the Native Americans, they were impossible to control, and would fight nearly as hard against perceived tyrannical intrusions into their world as they did against their fellow independent spirits in the *pays d'en haut*.⁷⁷ Nevertheless, their presence represented the arrival of a lasting presence of the Atlantic market economy, and either British (Canada) or Euro-American (US) economic empire. Performances of the culture of empire in the more stable population centres diluted the brutal aspects of the frontier experience and romanticized the positive aspects. As the land was expropriated from the indigenous inhabitants and commoditized, varieties of performance that spanned the cultural gulf between indigenous and imperial appeared. Urban theatre stages functioned to 'soften the brow' of these areas and move them in the direction of the market culture of the Atlantic world.⁷⁸

Squatter associations at the headwaters of the Ohio River, also known as the 'Forks' region, had been ordering provincial imperial officers from Philadelphia out of the area since at least the early 1770s. The Ohio Company had gone, but their customers and those who came after had not. Full-fledged regional independence all along the western mountains flourished with the imperial crisis of 1776. From North Carolina to the Forks, backwoods families sought, fought for and, at the conclusion of the war, planned for independence. The short-lived 'states' of Franklin, west of the Blue Ridge, and Westsylvania, at the Forks, were two political entities that expressed the desires of the locals, although these desires were ultimately repressed. By the 1790s, the repression of local autonomy was turned into federal taxation – more specifically, taxation designed to enrich the centers of economic empire at the expense of the peripheries. The Whiskey Rebellion of western Pennsylvania more or less began with a performance of 'rough music' – the tar and feathering of tax collector Robert Johnson at Pigeon Creek near Pittsburgh by fifteen to twenty men in blackface, some in women's dresses.⁷⁹ The folk culture from the old country provided precedence for protests, riots, tar-and-featherings and similar remedies for social maladies. As with the Stamp Act riots of Boston, Philadelphia and other colonial communities, Pennsylvania farmers responded to unwanted government intrusions into their lives with these kinds of performances. These peaked during the Whiskey Rebellion, where the tarring and feathering of tax collectors and Federalist supporters was

seen by the new federal government as a direct threat to its sovereignty. Indeed it was, and by intent. The new centralized power inherent in the Constitution was seen by many of its opponents as an incarnation of King-in-Parliament, the entity that had just been defeated in a protracted war. Western Pennsylvania had long been a hotbed for anti-federalism and what, by 1793, the Federalists were calling by 'Jacobinism' after the radical French revolutionaries. But they came by their opposition to Federalist policies honestly, particularly in light of the scheme to repay the nation's debt to rich war profiteers like Robert Morris, and to enable wealthy landowners and whiskey distillers to get and maintain an edge in the real estate and whiskey markets *vis-à-vis* the small farmers and producers. The connection between schemes to benefit the wealthy and the ability to employ those schemes in federal law was found in the combination of Robert Morris and Alexander Hamilton.⁸⁰

Historians have produced numerous studies of this fascinating series of events, and indeed it does reveal much about conflicting visions of what the new republic was to be. Those like the western Pennsylvania farmers resented taxes designed to both pay interest on bonds held by the rich and to undermine their own independence.

This force for democracy – in the true meaning of the word – was a direct threat to sovereignty manifested through wealth, whether landed or fluid. Indeed, here again was Robert Walpole; here again was Grenville's Stamp Tax; here again was a distant government imposing its will on local people to an unacceptable degree. Though it stopped just short of full rebellion, the performances steeped in folk traditions of blackface cross-dressing and rough music characterized an anti-imperial sentiment.

Yet, some of these individuals, like David Williamson, had participated in the pre meditated massacre of innocent, unarmed Moravian Indians at Gnadenhütten only a decade earlier. This 'performance' may have seemed to serve the interest of expanding empire on its face, but in fact probably cost more lives by generating much resentment among the indigenous peoples of the region. But Indian-hating was an institution at this point – General 'Mad' Anthony Wayne's 'Legion of the United States', a professional standing army trained to kill Indians, was populated in the majority by frontier militiamen like Williamson, the same men who opposed on principle a standing army that might (and would) be used against them.⁸¹ As for urban environments and empire, at the culmination of the Whiskey Rebellion, when six thousand armed militiamen mustered at Braddock's Field outside of Pittsburgh, the impetus to burn the young town as a symbol of heavy-handed imperialism was narrowly turned aside. So opposition to economic imperialism in western Pennsylvania was inherently a rural phenomenon that rejected imposition of policies favourable to the urban elites. And, as cultural divides were breeched in the *pays d'en haut*, this aspect of oppo-

sition holds true. On the other hand, theatrical performances were traditionally urban phenomena but, as shall be shown, that did not necessarily hold true in the Trans-Appalachian West.

In the 1790s, there were no urban areas, at least in the European sense, west of the Appalachian Mountains. Taverns along the road to the village and garrison of Pittsburgh, as well as on the Ohio, Mississippi and later the Missouri Rivers were places upon which travellers depended for sustenance, shelter and the few musical and theatrical performances that occurred in the early days of national expansion. These tavern keepers, like their neighbours, still enjoyed relative independence in these early days before the game was hunted out and food sources were completely commoditized. Francis Baily observed that the abundance of food was such that European notions of dependence and deference were unknown in the back country, '[T]hey pass their lives without any regard to the smiles or frowns of men in power'.⁸² Regardless of the amount of food available to travellers on any given day, the charge for room and board at the taverns was the same.⁸³ By the mid-1790s, circuses, menageries, and small amateur theatre troupes were no longer a rarity at these taverns.⁸⁴

Like the schemes to pay bondholders and tax small whiskey producers through the whiskey tax, land speculators also manipulated government to their advantage at the expense of small Euro-American landholders and settlers, to say nothing of Native American villagers. These land speculation schemes had direct ties to early theater performances west of the Alleghenies. Theatrical performances began to appear in the taverns of Pittsburgh in the 1780s. In April of 1790, the local newspaper announced the performance of *Cato* with *All the World's a Stage*, to be performed 'in the Garrison'.⁸⁵ By the mid-1790s, the 'New Theatre over the Allegheny' opened under the direction and management of officers from the Pennsylvania Population Company.⁸⁶ With rural farms and villages – Euro-American and Native American – predominating in the upper Ohio country and the Allegheny Mountains, theatre represented the earliest signs of an urban culture of empire formulating in Pittsburgh.

The Pennsylvania Population Company (PPC) was one of four land speculation companies to form in Philadelphia during this period. Along with the PPC, venture capitalists in Philadelphia formed the Asylum Company, the North American Land Company, and the Territorial Company. These were among the risk ventures in which Revolutionary War financier Robert Morris engaged, to his financial demise in the end. He was heavily invested at least in the Asylum and North American Companies, and many of the investors in these companies were also invested in the new Chestnut Street Theatre in Philadelphia.⁸⁷ There was an extremely close tie between these speculations and the governments of both Pennsylvania and the United States. This tie was rooted in the bond speculations that financed the war against Britain. In 1792, the Depart-

ment of War was planning to send a force led by General 'Mad' Anthony Wayne to put an end to the presence of Native Americans in the upper Ohio country. Knowing this, Pennsylvania's General Assembly passed 'An Act for the sale of vacant lands within this Commonwealth.' This made it possible to obtain land in western Pennsylvania north of the Ohio and west of the Allegheny River and Conewango Creek. For seven pounds ten shillings per one hundred acres, and a promise to 'cultivate, improve, and settle upon' the land, one could obtain up to four hundred acres plus six percent for roads and highways – a total of 424 acres.⁸⁸ There were two ways of obtaining the grant, by registering for land to be surveyed at the land office, or to make actual improvements on the surveyed land. This meant that land speculators in Philadelphia could obtain these lands without actually being in western Pennsylvania.

The cosy relationship between speculators and government officials, often the same individuals, led to abuse of a system designed to be abused. For example, John Nicholson, co-founder of the Asylum Company with Robert Morris was also Comptroller General of Pennsylvania, a position he had held since 1782. Nicholson was also on the State Board of Property, and had become fast friends with Pennsylvania Surveyor-General Daniel Brodhead. This relationship helped him to secure these land warrants, including purchasing some donation lands from soldiers who were desperate for money and did not realize the value of the land. To top it off, while soldiers could file grievances in the courts once they realized what had happened, Nicholson controlled the salaries of the judges that heard their cases and they typically ruled in favour of the landholding speculators.⁸⁹ The state legislature pursued Nicholson's impeachment for speculating in the donation holders' depreciation certificates – documents guaranteed to cover the difference between what they were owed and what they sold their land for – but he was ultimately acquitted.⁹⁰

He took out a total of 640 warrants on lands in the so-called Erie Triangle on or near Lake Erie, and on Beaver Creek, an Ohio tributary about 25 miles below the Forks. Each of these warrants was filed under a different name and provided a large chunk of the Asylum Company holdings. The courts openly permitted this practice, which gave no advantage to individual settlers, but gave speculators an opportunity to profit from lands taken from indigenous peoples through publicly funded wars. The PPC added another 500 warrants in Beaver County and in the Donation Lands – lands that had originally been set aside for the payment of Revolutionary War soldiers. Another investment block of the PPC was the Holland Company, a group of investors from Albany, New York who purchased 1,000 warrants through their agent Theophilus Cazenove. Several former Fort Pitt commanders and officers as well as Aaron Burr were also partners in the PPC. Their stated goal was to provide a wall of settlement

between the 'wilderness' and the residents of Pennsylvania, but in fact it was a land speculation venture.⁹¹

The plan included hiring settlers to secure the necessary improvements. They would be located in the corners of four separate warrants to be near one another for safety and mutual assistance. In each 400 acre tract, the investors sold one hundred acres to these settlers at a dollar an acre. The settlers would also receive another 100 acres for making improvements. This, ostensibly, would leave the speculators 200 acres in each warrant that would increase in value due to the settlers' improvements. Ideally, the settlers would lay out a community at the 'corners' to further enhance the value of the land. In light of this 'development' project, it makes sense that the PPC would finance a theatrical troupe to try and 'bring civility' to the frontier town of Pittsburgh. If Pittsburgh were seen as a burgeoning Philadelphia, land buyers, hesitant from decades of Indian wars, would be emboldened to pay higher prices and continue adding value to the property.⁹²

The 'New Theatre over the Allegheny' presented a variety of entertainments in the 'season' of 1795–6. Only two mentions appear in the *Pittsburgh Gazette* of any performance during this period. One is a notice from George Saunders, who returned 'his most respectful thanks of the Ladies and Gentlemen of Pittsburgh for the encouragement he has met with and begs leave to inform them that he will return the week after the court with his brother, when they will exhibit a variety of new performances.'⁹³ The other, under the heading, 'Theatrical Intelligence', mentions a variety of performances presented at this theatre since it had 'opened early last season.' Some of these were stock plays from the London stage. These included *Who's the Dupe?*, *High Life Below Stairs*, *The Padlock*, *Like Master Like Man* and other well known farces. But there were also a number of enigmatically titled performances. In addition to 'the Gallery being much diverted by Lofty Tumbling, and the old fashioned amusement of the *Tight Rope*', there were plays with local themes. *Trip to Presque'isle*, *The Pre-emption, or Flats of Le Bœuf*, *The Actual Settlement of Eleven Point Gained*, all have titles with western Pennsylvania references which, lacking further information, one must speculate that perhaps a travelling troupe had improvised some plays on local topics. This was the immediate aftermath of the Whiskey Rebellion, so there was no shortage of material for such improvisations.⁹⁴

Meanwhile, in Dunlap's *The Glory of Columbia, Her Yeomanry!*, the leader to whom most felt a keen allegiance, George Washington, was presented onstage in larger than life form complete with a (metaphoric) pedestal. Washington was quite conscious of this image and took great pains to live up to it. That he was the 'Father of Our Nation' has long been a cliché – but a brief study of this play just how much this was true. In Act II, Scene 3, Dunlap composed the following exchange between Williams and his compadres, Van Vert and Paulding – fel-

low yeoman from New York State – after their delivery of André to General Washington. The General immediately discovered the damning note in André's purse that proved Arnold's betrayal and thanked the soldier-farmers for their good works:

Van Vert: Now comrades, we have received the only reward a soldier ought to look for; and though the general has assured us of reward from our country, yet all a soldier should wish is the thanks of his commander.

Paulding: The thanks of his commander, and the approbation of his own conscience.

Williams: Dang it, what a nice warm feel a man has here about the upper part of his waistcoat, when he knows he's been doing what he ought to do. I don't think I ever felt so proud as I did just now, when our great commander, our own glorious Washington, took me by the hand and said, 'thank you,' ay he said, 'well done my lad, thank you.'

Paulding: We must always remember the moment as the most glorious of our lives. The approbation of our country is at all times precious, but when that approbation is made known by such a man, so glorious and so dignified, it becomes inestimable.

Van Vert: What a noble soldierly mien!

Paulding: O bless his face, say I! to a lad who has not seen any thing but continental bills for a twelvemonth, the sight of a white faced Carolus, or a yellow George Rex, oughtent be as bad as a wet Sunday; yet dang me, if I hadn't rather see a Washington's head, on a deal board, than all the gold heads in the bank of England.⁹⁵

The tenor of this conversation is a mixture of hero worshipping and moral lecturing. But Dunlap was trying to combine what he saw as the often-awkward combination of pandering for public attention for receipts, and republican instruction for the sake of the new nation. The patriarch Washington as the Father of the Country actually reflects a disturbing and highly studied familial paradigm. Washington was the Father of a family called the United States. Whatever the United States family intended to do was by definition beyond reproach. Anyone who contradicted this mythic structure represented the enemy. In the end, it all adds up to the representation of imperial expansion as the perpetuation of virtue, a kind of bait-and-switch that obscured the truth that the new republic had more in common with the British Empire than most were willing to admit.

One of the main components of the rationale for expansion into 'Indian Country' in the early republic was the perceived ability of Euro-Americans to self-govern virtuously. Opinions on this subject were very strong. Jefferson, for example, believed that this kind of virtue was something inherently different than that of Native Americans. They, in his view, were incapable of assimilating this European style of virtuous self-rule in the short term and should be removed to the West for their own protection. Indian virtue depended upon having

enough land to practice their mixed hunter-gatherer and agricultural lifeways. The capacity for virtuous self-rule, however, required educating the public on the matter. To this end, William Dunlap was a fervent believer in government subsidized theatre. In this era of republican idealism, revolutionary sentiment was still very strong and profiteering still frowned upon by a large segment of society. Indeed, Madison himself had recently argued that making money without productive labour was immoral. Dunlap was unambiguous about how to ensure that theatre was used for the good:

[M]ake the theatre an object of governmental patronage; take the mighty engine into the hands of the people as represented by their delegates and magistrates ... Pure instruction 'could' banish the poison of the licensed murderers in every corner and every avenue of our towns ... If an association of men of taste, literature, and moral standing in the community, should build and open a theatre upon such a plan, select a man of acquirements fitted for the management and pay him liberally, not allowing him any interest in the profits or losses, and supervising the whole by a committee or otherwise, gain would not be the object of such an association, and yet gain might accrue. Actors, in either case, of a theatre protected by the government or by an association of private individuals should be well paid and selected for their morals as well as their talents; they would then be instruments of good at all times; and, sheltered from the temptations which now beset the profession, they would be honoured in private as applauded in public.⁹⁶

Dunlap's desire to use the theatre to 'banish the poison of the licensed murderers in every corner and every avenue of our towns'⁹⁷ through 'instruction' went unheeded by the new federal government.

The connections between economic empire, which increasingly in the United States meant speculation, and the economics of the theatre in this period have been documented elsewhere. Heather Nathans, Ginger Strand and others have shown how the economics of the Federal period defined the politics, and how theatre tried playing to both the Federalist and Republican groups.⁹⁸ The concept of republican virtue that Dunlap hoped to perpetuate was fairly strong through the years of the early republic. But the draw of economic empire was powerful, where anyone willing to play the game – to 'strive with the strivers', had a chance to strike it rich. Federalists, the economic elite and their followers who supported market economics, and those with more republican sympathies competed fiercely with each other in the polarized 1790s and represented two different visions for the new nation.⁹⁹ Using the analytical aspect of empire, both were determined to perpetuate the 'empire republic'. The disputed concerns were a matter of economic and political democracy within the broader context of empire. For all the ink spilled over the political divide in the theatres of Boston, New York and Philadelphia, even theatre historian Heather Nathans admits that

'Neither theatre could submit a list of proprietors with exclusive allegiance to one political agenda.'¹⁰⁰ Both 'sides' were on the side of empire and expansion.

In many ways, this was a replay of the *c.* 1730 political conflict in Britain between the Walpolean Whigs and the 'Country' radicals. The former supported economic empire and political control by an economic elite comprised of fluid wealth (reincarnated as the Federalist Party); the latter argued for a more constitutionally balanced system yet remained unopposed to and invested in empire (reincarnated as Jeffersonian republicanism). The diffused nature of the indigenous peoples who operated with relative independence in their own milieu with the 'other-than-human persons' on the periphery of the empire had an advantage in their egalitarian distribution of power – for awhile. As Jefferson noted, this diffused power could be quite resilient as long as self-sufficiency was maintained. But the temptations of market society infiltrated these societies, disrupting their advantage and increasing their dependence. They went from living around their own centre to living on the periphery of empire. Increasingly, they were forced to shift their focus to trading posts connected to the American capitalist banking and manufacturing centres for essential items.¹⁰¹ As for the working class, they were by definition part of the market societal structure and were subject to the drive to undercut prices by investors, masters, and entrepreneurs. This led to 'sweating out' commodity production, moving away from the old guild system of training skilled craftsmen.¹⁰² With the adoption of the Constitution, those who had gained fluid and landed wealth at the expense of indigenous peoples and on the backs of servants and slaves had replaced King-in-Parliament, which itself had subverted the power structure of the monarchy, aristocracy, and the church. This engine of economic empire seemed to be an ineluctable force.

4 THE CIRCUS, THE THEATRE AND THE FRONTIER

Under the headline ‘On the Equestrian Pantheon’, referring to John Bill Ricketts’s circus in Boston in 1795, the *Columbian Centinel* referenced the same empires as the political architects of the new republic so frequently did:

Egypt of old, the Crocodile ador’d,
Reptiles held sacred and the Bull implor’d;
Rome’s Pantheon still could boast a nobler line,
Whose images of men were deem’d divine;
But Boston claims the highest right by odds,
Whose Horses fill the place of – All the Gods!’¹

In the late eighteenth century North America, the newest performance genre was also one of the oldest – the circus. Plebian in its orientation to be sure, menageries and equestrian shows nevertheless have their roots in empire and militarism. In the ancient Mediterranean, Egyptian, Greek and Roman cultures all employed some sort of circus menagerie. Queen Hatshepsut’s Egyptian trading fleet to the Indian Ocean returned with ‘monkeys, greyhounds, oxen, a giraffe, and various kinds of birds.’² Ptolemy II (309–247 BC) presented a spectacular parade of wild animals in honour of Dionysus, the Greek God who was said to have power over them. This parade, reportedly the earliest in the historical record, was led by a gold-festooned elephant, followed by more elephants, lions, goats, water buffaloes, ostriches, deer and camels. Each camel bore a female slave with exotic spices and perfumes. Ethiopian slaves loaded with ivory, ebony, gold powder, and gold and silver goblets followed behind the camels.³ The women and slaves, the displays of exotic animals from conquered lands, and the plundered booty from those lands are a timeless characteristic of empire one to which its opponents usually object.

The rebirth of the circus in the early modern period is usually traced to the rise of Philip Astley’s public demonstrations of horsemanship in England in the eighteenth century. A retired Sergeant Major of the Fifteenth King’s Royal Regiment of Light Dragoons (the British Imperial Army), Astley started a ‘rid-

ing school' that soon became the pre-eminent site of equestrian performances in London. Before he was done, Astley had performed for all the major heads of state in Europe, and trained students who would perpetuate circus performances on both sides of the Atlantic. About the same time as Astley was gaining popularity, an individual by the name of Price exhibited his equestrian skills at the '3 Hats of Islington' in 1758 – a venue in central London at St John Street, Clerkenwell (also known as Islington) – and noted in Isaac Bickerstaff's *The Hypocrite*. This served as an inspiration to Thomas Johnson, known as the 'Irish Tartar', for his horsemanship. The Irish Tartar performed regularly, once before three Cherokee Chiefs visiting at the Star and Garter Tavern in London's Burton Street. Jacob Bates brought equestrian performances to the colonies in 1772, performing in Philadelphia and the next year in New York City. His performance included a 'burlesque on horsemanship', a recreation of Philip Astley's popular 'Billy Buttons, or the Tailor's Ride to Brentford'.⁴ The character 'Billy Buttons' was a tailor and an inept horseman who had to ride hurriedly to Brentford in order to vote in an election. This performance included the equestrian riding backwards on the horse, seeming to fall off only to spring back on, and otherwise create a satirical performance of the non-horseman with implied overtones of male virility. After the revolution, the first American born circus rider, Thomas Pool, announced that he would perform 'numerous miraculous performances' on horseback at full speed, including tossing an orange into the air and catching it with a fork, mounting and dismounting while firing a pistol, in addition to the 'Tailor's Ride'. His show was assisted by a clown and several musicians.⁵

The circus renaissance in early modern Britain and her colonies is a testament to not only the imperial culture, but that the references to and similarities with Rome and earlier empires demonstrate the belief that these were political, economic and cultural systems to be emulated. This chapter continues an analysis of the indigenous and colonial performance spectrum as the new nation began expanding beyond the Appalachian Mountains. Utilizing the memoirs of the plebeian dancer John Durang and the bourgeois actor/manager John Bernard, I analyze this spectrum of performance, particularly its representations of race and class as they were embedded in this spectrum.⁶

Scholars of the subject agree that it was the Ricketts's 'Pantheon' in Philadelphia that represented the beginning of consistent circus performances in the United States. Ricketts had been trained by Charles Hughes at the London Royal Circus, an establishment that competed with the master British equestrian Philip Astley for an audience.⁷ His success in establishing a circus in the United States parallels its growth in England and illustrates the close relationship between British and Euro-American imperial culture. Ricketts's circus gave competition to the 'legitimate' theatres of the three large northern markets – Boston, New York and Philadelphia – in the 1790s. Other actor-circus

performers attempted to establish themselves in these urban markets. The Frenchman Alexander Placide, who also performed at the John Street Theatre with the Old American Company, had come from Astley's circus in London where he had been known as the 'Great Devil' because of his tumbling abilities. Placide would balance a peacock feather in a variety of ways, perform feats of tumbling or work the tightrope or slack-wire. A man called Bennett, a rope dancer from London, performing in 'Mr. Waldron's Long Room in St. George's Street' in New York, 'danced a hornpipe on his head; sang a humorous song; and showed up the whole art of Animal Magnetism, or Mesmerism'. On the corner of Beekman and Gold Streets, the 'Speaking Wax Figure', suspended by ribbons, would give paying customers answers to any questions about their futures.⁸

These performances, coming as they did in the 1790s, were the harbingers of a more mystical and irrational *zeitgeist* that supplanted the neo-classical appeals to reason characteristic of the revolutionary period. Ultimately known as 'Romanticism', this *zeitgeist* included circus, melodrama, pantomime and spectacle in the performing arts. And while it did not reach its full flowering until later in the nineteenth century, the transformation was well under way in the 1790s. What concerns the present study is the relationship between these performances and empire in early America. Many working class people drew little distinction between theatre and circus. They were simply points in a continuum of popular culture in the early republic. Indeed, the folk cultures of England, Ireland, Germany and elsewhere were increasingly employed by playwrights, theatre and circus managers and others to draw paying crowds to their performances.

Ricketts's circus drew theatregoers away from the stock plays of the day and thoroughly dismayed individuals like William Dunlap who already bemoaned the encroaching populism of the theatre. Ricketts's arrival affected first the Southwark Theatre in Philadelphia, and when he opened a circus in Greenwich Street, New York City, attendance at Dunlap's John Street Theatre declined as well. Ricketts also provided competition to theatres in Boston and Hartford, Connecticut.⁹ He and John Durang, a dancer, actor, and equestrian, proved to be a memorable combination, touring Canada in 1797–8 and playing in Philadelphia through 1799.¹⁰

Ricketts performed with President George Washington in the audience on 22 April 1793 and again on 24 January 1797. Two days after the second performance, Washington reportedly sold him a white horse named Jack for \$150. Ricketts advertized that Washington had 'presented' him the twenty-eight year-old horse which had carried the General during at least a portion of the Revolutionary War – a claim which naturally translated into receipts.¹¹ Illustrating the hazards that performers often confronted, this horse was shortly afterward confiscated by the Sheriff in Baltimore for unpaid expenses.¹² Durang noted that the horse was not purchased from Washington himself, but through Robert

Morris. This must have happened before Morris's imprisonment in a Philadelphia debtor's prison which occurred that same year and perhaps was a desperate attempt on the part of Morris to raise money.¹³ In any case, by the nineteenth century, Ricketts had helped to widen the performance spectrum considerably in Euro-American society. As an advocate of 'legitimate' theatre that appealed to the bourgeois culture of Boston, English born actor and future theatre manager John Bernard must have been aghast when a Mr Robertson, 'of the Amphitheatre, London', performed at the Federal Theatre in Boston (Bernard's residency) on Christmas Eve of 1800. Robertson:

[G]ave imitations of the English robin, thrush, skylark, and nightingale; whistled an overture, accompanied by the band; danced an egg-hornpipe blindfolded, displayed feats of ground and lofty tumbling, threw somersaults backward and forward; and leaped through a balloon of fire fourteen feet above the stage, or over the heads of twenty soldiers with guns and fixed bayonets. He would also, in his 'Antipodean Whirligig', whirl round on his head, without using his hands, at the rate of two hundred and fifty times in a minute, with fireworks attached to his body.¹⁴

Robertson also performed on the main stages in Philadelphia and New York, but his appearance in Boston underscored the wide variety of performances people were coming to expect even from the Federal Street Theatre, the perceived stronghold of the bourgeois Boston Brahmins.

In the Hudson Valley, at Albany between 1803 and 1808, wild animal displays, dramatic recitations, 'displays of electricity'¹⁵ and the occasional fencing and dancing lessons were the main attractions at the Thespian Hotel and other locations. In 1806, an African lion was exhibited, with the show concluding with 'a grand bait to take place between the lion, six bears and twelve bull-dogs in a large field where ample accommodations will be prepared for spectators; admittance \$1'.¹⁶ Such animals were beginning to appear even on 'polite' theatre stages. At the Park Theatre in New York on 10 May 1802, during Act II of *Alexander the Great*, two camels 'just arrived from the coast of Africa' graced the stage.¹⁷ Elephants were also in demand in the early republic. Arriving in New York in April of 1796 aboard the *America*, Captain Jacob Crowninshield brought from Bengal – another colony in the British Empire – a two-year-old elephant bull. This appears to have been the first elephant on an American stage. The young Thomas Abthorpe Cooper, attached to the Philadelphia Theatre of Thomas Wignell and Alexander Reinagle, hired the elephant from its owner, 'Mr. Owen', for sixty dollars. William Dunlap lamented that:

Those who had declined to take seats to see and support the best tragedian, [referring to Cooper], although not yet so finished as afterwards, that had yet played in America, filled the house to overflowing to see the stage dishonoured by an elephant.¹⁸

While Dunlap may have objected to the quadruped invasion of the bourgeois theatre stage, it was a reflection of the democratizing empire that emerged in the aftermath of the American Revolution, and was characteristic of the expansion of empire beyond the eastern seaboard.

In Kentucky, where the 'dark and bloody ground' of the frontier struggle for the land was being won by Euro-Americans, this colonial culture of empire was also beginning to appear. Before 1800, numerous performances could be found in Lexington, the 'Athens of the West', some of whom were likely associated with Placide, Ricketts and others when they were east of the mountains. It is likely that other performances came from the citizens themselves. Rope dancers, magicians, musicians, and actors attempted to provide diversions for the population in exchange for their expenses and perhaps a little more. Where indigenous performance patterns acknowledged a dependence on and oneness with nature, bull- and bear-baiting were the norm for the culture of empire. In Kentucky, in the early years of the nineteenth century, bear-baiting was a popular pastime as seen in this advertisement from the period:

Rare Sport

To the lovers of Sport, their attention is called that on the 29th of December there will be a Bear Baiting

At my house on the Cynthiana road, one mile from Paris and 10 o'clock A.M. when a three year old HE BEAR will be turned loose and five dogs will be entered every half hour to fight him; according to regulations to be made known at the time of entering.

Also, the half of a SHE BEAR will be barbecued and as good a dinner furnished as the country can provide. No quarrelsome person will be permitted to remain as a guest as peace and harmony will be promoted and expected.

O. A. Forsythe.¹⁹

Other performances in early Kentucky included a man calling himself Rannie, who reportedly broke watches without touching them, made them move across the floor, performed surgery without pain to the patient, swallowed knives, restored beheaded chickens to life, caught bullets fired from a gun with his teeth, and performed ventriloquism. Horseracing was popular early on in Kentucky as well. Wax figures and menageries also made appearances. In short, the camp-followers of empire were not far behind the 'front lines' of the expanding empire republic.²⁰

There are important differences between the activities of indigenous peoples in their seasonal rounds and regular tributes to the other-than-human world, and the colonial 'sport' of bear-baiting or the 'entertainments' of itinerant slight-of-hand tricksters. In the indigenous paradigm, there were known examples of *sachems*, for example, who utilized slight-of-hand to demonstrate their skills with

the unseen world; that is, the dead, or with other-than-human forces. To some extent, as in the colonial world, this can be seen as a way to make a living in the indigenous village. But the parallel between the social role of these *sachems* and, in the colonial society, priests and pastors, is much closer than between *sachems* and itinerant entertainers. Bear skins were stuffed and set up in the ceremonial house as an honoured guest during special ceremonies acknowledging the power of the bear 'people', but this was not seen as an 'entertainment'. It was the commoditized nature of the skill, the trick, the display of exotic animals or the blood sports of bear-baiting that define and separate the colonial from the indigenous in this 'block' of the North American performance spectrum.

In the early republic, the upper Hudson Valley to Lake Champlain and beyond was still very much a 'frontier' area in many respects. John Bill Ricketts and Boston Thespian John Bernard were among the early managers to bring theatre to this so-called Mahican Channel in the early republic. Before the revolution, the American Company had travelled as far as Albany during the off season (summer) of 1769. But resistance to the theatre was strong then and only grew during the revolutionary years. Serious dramatic performance did not return to Albany until 1785, and then an offshoot of the Old American Company of players led by a Mr Allen had to confront serious opposition to their performances. Most of the resistance was of the printed variety in the *Albany Gazette*, but a petition was circulated in the community to ban the troupe's performances. Signed by ninety citizens, the roots of this resistance were grounded in republicanism, economics and religion. Pro-theatre arguments usually tried to make the case for theatre as moral instruction and education. The authors of this petition had heard, but were not buying, that rhetoric:

Though ... the inhabitants are suspected of rusticity and want of politeness, they have so much common sense, we trust, as to judge and to declare that we stand in no need of plays and play-actors to be instructed in our duty or good manners, being already provided with other and much better means to obtain sufficient knowledge and improvement in both. But the pressing necessities and wants of many families, after a long continued and depressing war, the debts still due to the public for the safety and convenience of the state and this city; as well as many objects of charity (not to mention the gratitude we owe to God), call upon us to request the impartial reconsideration of your resolution by which that authority was given, and to make such amendments as are consistent with your wisdom and prudence, to acquaint your citizens that the intent and meaning thereof was not publicly to authorize and thereby to applaud and encourage theatrical exhibitions of those persons, who, having left another more populous city pretend to stay but a short time amongst us, probably to support themselves on the way to another place, where they expect to meet with better friends and political connections; but in reality will drain us of our money, if not instill into the minds of the imprudent principles incompatible with that virtue which is the true basis of republican liberty and happiness.²¹

In spite of the petition, the city fathers of Albany ruled that they had no legal right to prevent the presentations, an early example of libertarianism trumping republicanism in rural America. Allen and his fellow players were able to present their shows, which were the stock plays of the day – Shakespeare, Sheridan, Otway; emphasizing *The London Merchant* for its morality tale – from December to February, when the ice allowed them to proceed to Montreal by sleigh. They left town having paid all their bills and exhibited model behaviour; but resistance to the theatre remained strong in the American backcountry.²² Mr Lewis Hallam's 'Old American Company' played in Albany from August to October of 1803. This professional troupe, who came north without their theatre manager William Dunlap, played many of the stock plays of the day, e.g., *Douglas*, *Inkle and Yarico*, *George Barnwell* and *School for Scandal*. Between Allen's 1786 visit and John Bernard's arrival in 1811 as manager of the Green Street Theatre, this was the only other performance of this type in the historical record.²³

Ricketts's tour to Canada through Albany was a departure from both the stock plays of eastern theatres and menageries beginning to circulate in the new United States. Being a circus that was usually performed outdoors, the resistance from theatre opponents was somewhat lessened and interaction with the locals somewhat increased. The only known accounts that exists of this journey is John Durang's memoir and several advertisements in Montreal and Quebec City newspapers.²⁴ It is useful to compare the account of Durang, an actor, dancer, equestrian and circus clown of humble origins, with the observations of John Bernard, an English actor of bourgeois origins and aspirations who made a similar tour some twelve years after Ricketts and Durang. The narratives of these two former co-workers at Philadelphia's Chestnut Theatre provide insight into the role of class in these frontier performances. Moreover, by observing how these two men viewed non-whites and for that matter non-Anglos in their respective tours, one can see that these narratives represent performances in a 'white empire republic' that underscore the presence of an 'untouchable' (to many) non-white 'underclass'. The acknowledgment of this underclass in an analysis of early American culture reveals the imperial nature of the early republic.

Durang was born in Lancaster, Pennsylvania in 1768, the son of immigrants from Alsace-Lorraine – his father was French and served in the army in the Seven Years War, his mother was from the German side. They had only recently arrived in the New World, at Philadelphia in November of 1767. His father Jacob was a barber and they soon settled in York, Pennsylvania (Durang refers to it as 'little York'), where John grew up and to where he would return. French and German as well as English were spoken in the Durang household and the language skills thus obtained would serve the younger Durang well in his travels, both to Canada with Ricketts, and in his own endeavours in the Pennsylvania 'Dutch' backcountry.²⁵

Durang became interested in the theatre as a child when he attended seasonal fairs and the 'harvest frolic' that always brought a wide variety of entertainments and an expanded market place. Fiddles and dancing, 'showfolks with their signs out, hand organs and trumpits to invite the people to see poppet shows, wire dancing, slight of hand' provided a welcome diversion from the routine of small-town life. But Durang recognized the hazards of such events, and his small-town cautiousness held him in good stead when he became a showman himself. 'The greatest evil', he wrote, 'is a cohesion of gamblers who infest the country towns at the time of fairs, harvest frolics, and at the races ... And yet those very gamesters make the appearance of good morel citizens when they walk the streets of our capital cities'.²⁶

The revolution came to York, of course, and Durang was impressed by the British officers who boarded at their house and played their music almost nightly to the great delight of all concerned. Jacob Durang moved his family to Philadelphia after the British left that city, and John reported being impressed with the fireworks shows put on by Sieur Gerard, the first French Ambassador to the new nation. Sieur Gerard also impressed the Durangs and other Americans by the fact that '[h]e seldom wrote in his carriage, but walk'd our streets like a plain American citizen. Numbers of poor families were supported from his house and table.' And young John saw his first pantomime, performed by le Sieur's household domestics in the Southwark Theatre.²⁷

The travelling company of Wall and Ryan arrived at the Southwark Theatre in 1783 from Baltimore and it was then that Durang first saw someone, a Mr Roussel, dance a hornpipe which, Durang reported, 'charmed my mind'. He talked the dancer into boarding at his father's house and learned much from him during his stay. Having mastered the hornpipe and the *allemande*, he struggled with the pigeon wing (a dance step executed by jumping into the air and clapping the legs together). One night in a dream he found himself dancing the dance perfectly. Upon awakening, he found he could not only execute the dance flawlessly, but could quickly teach it to anyone who wanted to learn. At age fifteen, Lewis Hallam of the Old American Company, saw Durang dancing at a private engagement and asked him to audition for the company as a dancer. Hallam hired Durang for a brief stint in Boston, where he had the valuable experience of making money doing what he loved. His newfound vocation would one day earn him the title of the 'Greatest Dancer in America'.²⁸

In 1793, Durang joined the Old American Company in Philadelphia and moved with them to John Street Theatre in New York under Dunlap. In 1795, John Bill Ricketts was performing at the Greenwich Street Theatre in New York. He sent a note and an offer of twenty-five dollars a week every week plus a benefit in every town if Durang would join his circus, an offer Durang accepted in spite of Dunlap's offer to raise his salary. Thus began an odyssey that would

ultimately make Durang an autonomous player in the United States and Canada – one of the early backcountry touring actors in the new nation.²⁹

Now a seasoned performer, in 1797 Durang left with Ricketts on the journey north to Canada. Ricketts the equestrian, with Dunlap the dancer, actor and clown, along with a Mr Leulier, a musician, six horses and a supporting cast, sailed up the Hudson River to Albany on 19 July. Travel was difficult, but the river was tidal as far as Albany, and even if the boats (there was a small flotilla of a variety of travellers) snagged on sand bars, the tide would free them eventually. Durang had a favourable view of the town at first, but it began to fade as the 'people were unsociable and the town dull'.³⁰ There was still a large percentage of Dutch in this town of six churches and a great many taverns 'without custom except from strangers',³¹ and upwards of ten stagecoaches a day leaving the river town for outlying villages. Their first performance was 31 July, about a week after they first arrived. The circus grossed \$160 that evening, with most of the crowd remaining outside and boring holes in the planks to peep through. A fire consumed much of the town on 5 August, which seemingly put an end to the circus in Albany. Durang suggested that they give benefits for the victims of the fire, after which they could take benefits for themselves, an idea which met with success all around.

The company left Albany on 14 August and began the arduous journey to Montreal. Durang's is a workman-like account; an unpretentious relation with numerous anecdotes including commentary on the abject poverty of the rural families. For example, shoes were considered a luxury for many who travelled 5 or 6 miles for basic items like flour. These rural folk were not a source of material for bourgeois parlour monologues for Durang as they would be for John Bernard. Durang was among people to whom he could relate. When they stopped in Fairhaven, for example, at the south end of Lake Champlain, they asked for a good breakfast with some poultry. The local landlord had none other than the turkeys running in the field. All agreed to try and catch one and, with the help of a couple of local youths, they managed to chase a flock into the main street of the town, where one was captured. Ricketts himself took on the job of preparing the meal with the assistance of the landlady in her kitchen. The troupers rotated particular tasks and it was his turn that day to be the 'valet' when, Durang reported, 'everything was done to please us'.³² After relating this story, Durang wrote that 'upon the whole they did not know what to make of us, as we never reveal'd our occupation, but when necessary'.³³ Again, as will be seen with Bernard's later narrative, Durang made no jokes at the expense of their Yankee hosts, nor patronizing comments about their rusticity; only showed gratitude for the assistance the company received and pity for those who endured the wretched conditions so common in the backcountry. The intent here is not to paint a romantic picture of the equestrians, they were certainly eager to help the

'Yankeys' or the Canadians part with their scarce cash. This endeavour was, after all, part and parcel of the Atlantic market economy, and represented entrepreneurial capitalism in the field of entertainment. Yet the performers, as proud as they may have been of their skills, did not consider their audiences to be on a decidedly lower echelon of society, as did actors of a bourgeois inclination like John Bernard and others did.

There were a number of stops for Ricketts's entourage at small houses and, in one case, a two room cabin with a family and 'six or eight reapers [who] came in the other room, men and women ... After eating something, [they] made a regemental bed with buffalo skins on the floor, and all lay down to sleep in sight of us'.³⁴ Durang and Ricketts laid awake the whole night, partly because of the captain's unwillingness 'to prevent natures report ... being the signals of wind. Upon the whole this was a scene of rustic simplicity'.³⁵

On the twenty-fifth of August the group arrived in Montreal and found lodgings at an inn kept by Simon Clark, a New Englander who had moved to Canada during the Revolution and worked as an interpreter to the Indians for the British. Theatre had been a part of the imperial culture of British occupation in Lower Canada since the end of the French-Indian War. Previously, students at Montreal College had presented French plays to male audiences. In the 1780s, William Moore began managing a small theatrical company that presented stock English plays to Montreal and Quebec subscribers and a limited number of the general public. But for the most part, amateur companies staged the plays that did appear, with men playing the female parts because of the Church's interdiction of females on the stage. Aside from the occasional performances by bored officers in the garrison, that was the extent of the Canadian theatre scene in the late 1790s.³⁶

Ricketts secured some of the 'King's land' for a circus grounds, constructed a ring, a stage, dressing room and stables, and on 5 September the company opened. The show went on every afternoon at four o'clock with music from the 60th Regimental band of the Royal American Grenadiers. While Ricketts – 'the best that ever was in America' – handled the horses, Durang:

[W]as the Clown on foot and horseback, and obliged to furnish all the jokes for the ring, and to ride the Tailor to Brentford, with the dialogue which I was obliged to speak in French, German, and English (the principle inhabitants are French, a great many Germans, a few merchants, and British solders English).

I rode the foxhunter, leaping over the bar with the mounting and dismounting while in full speed, taking a flying leap on horseback through a paper sun, in character of a drunken man on horseback, tied to a sack standing on two horses while I changed to woman's clothes; rode in full speed standing on two horses, Mr. Ricketts at the same time standing on my shoulders, with master Hutchins at the same time standing in the attitude of Mercury on Mr. Ricketts' shoulders forming a pyramid. I performed the drunken soldier on horseback, still vaulted, I dancet on the stage, I

was the Harlequin in the pantomimes, occasionally I sung a comic song. I tumbled on the slack rope and performed on the slack wire. I introduced mechanical exhibitions in machinery and transparencies, I produced exhibitions of fireworks. In short, I was performer, machinist, painter, designer, music compiler, the bill maker, and treasurer.

Again, this represents a significant contrast to the Bernard tour described below. Durang and Ricketts were of a yeoman mindset; which is to say, if something needed to be done, they did not wait until someone from the working class appeared – they did it themselves.

Because they were the first ‘circus’ to visit colonial Canada, many of the audience apparently thought their horses were supernatural. Ricketts and Durang could both dance a hornpipe on the saddle of a horse galloping at full speed and the audience wanted to know how the horses galloped in time with the music. The musicians were, of course, playing the music to the beat of the horses’ stride. When the crowd was ‘convincet that we are like other people’, they were ‘much pleased with us.’³⁷

But the Canada experience was only just beginning. Ricketts and Durang decided to winter in Montreal and began constructing a proper circus building. Using native stones as walls and the Southwark Theatre as a model, the company constructed a room big enough for their equestrian exhibitions. The theatre included a stage for plays, boxes, a pit, a dome with skylights, a coffeehouse, a waiting room and dressing rooms. Durang painted the dome light blue with cupids bearing rose garlands around the circle. With a festooned blue curtain, scenery, a frontispiece and stage doors, each with a niche with ‘busts of armory’, the company performed the pantomimes *Death of Captain Cook*, *Robinson Crusoe*, various Harlequin pantomimes and ballet dances; not to mention the usual equestrian feats.³⁸

In the autumn of 1797, Ricketts and Durang visited the Indian village of Caughnawaga about 10 miles south-west of Montreal. Ricketts dressed in ‘Indian attire’ that he sometimes used as riding clothes. ‘Captain Tommoa, an old Indian warrior of 76’ was their host. The visitors dined on beans and hominy, Durang’s first taste of Indian corn. A group of the villagers, who could converse with the visitors only in French, performed a dance for them. Durang’s account of the event is interesting in its attention detail that only a ‘fellow dancer’ might record. The dance was performed:

[W]ith a most reserved modesty, by couples behind each other. They moved on slow with only one simple step, something of the clesade [glissade], their countenance an innocent down look, quite erect in their whole person, their arms strait down by the side, all keeping an exact time to their music, which was play’d by an old chief beating one stick against the other ... Those girls would move in Indian file and strait line to right and left and meet again, then lead off to right and left in Indian file, round and

meet at the bottom and join their pardners [*sic*] as before, with a repeat of the same, gracefully. They did not fling their arms and legs about as I have seen ladies do at our balls.³⁹

The reader is not told the meaning of the dance, probably because Durang did not know. From the description, it could have been a dance performed for young people to 'partner up' with those for whom they had amorous feelings. This would have been a dance done more for social occasions than as part of the ritual cycle associated with the seasons. The Indians had guests who were interested in their dances and they wanted to be hospitable, a central feature of indigenous culture.

At his benefit a few days later, borrowing a few 'Indian clothes' from Northwest Company traders and utilizing a native outfit he had purchased from the Indians for rum, Durang imitated some these Indian dances. In this performance, one finds a combination of one folk culture identifying with another on the one hand, and on the other a representation of empire in a Euro-American view of indigenous peoples. Durang danced a 'Pipe Dance, an 'Eagle Tail Dance', and a 'War Dance', which he said he had learned from the Caughnawaga. But he enhanced the performance with some improvised 'postures ... representing the manner they kill and scalp and take prisoners with the yells and war hoops'.⁴⁰ While Durang was willing to socialize with and learn from the Indians, taking what they taught him onto the stage in his own act, the inclusion of warrior stereotypes was a blatant expression of imperial culture and worked to justify Euro-American atrocities against them. One is reminded of a version of a war dance among Indians of the Ohio country: before leaving the village for an attack on whites who were encroaching on their lands, they would dance around the circle mimicking the depredations the whites had perpetrated against them. In the case of Durang's performance, he was not going on the 'warpath', he was 'entertaining', and he knew that his audience was fascinated by and would pay for a representation of the 'Ignoble Savage' with whom they were at war. Although he gave a performance of plebeian culture to his Montreal audience, it was still a performance in support of empire and in opposition to the indigenous paradigm operating in North American.

Nevertheless, it is relatively rare to find a Euro-American performance of Indian culture in this period that is this measured. As a Euro-American populist performer in the early republic, it is likely that Durang's attitude towards the Caughnawaga had an element of condescension. But as it comes across in his memoir, he did not blatantly champion or display a sense of superiority. The only negative comment Durang offered regarding the Indians in his memoir – aside from perpetuating the 'scalping' and 'war whoop' stereotype – was his recollection of an 'Indian frolic'. After selling their furs and game in Montreal,

the men would engage in drunken and often violent behaviour while the women hid themselves and the children from the onslaught. However, Durang's attitude towards the Indians, as well as the Canadians and Vermonters, was certainly more sympathetic than anything found in the writings of Bernard and his circle. The overlap of race and class in the indigenous/colonial spectrum is an interesting one that deserves further attention.

Soon after this performance, Durang suffered an injury when his horse's hooves hit a slick spot where the roof had leaked and the horse fell on Durang's leg. He was not seriously injured – he danced a hornpipe immediately afterward to demonstrate to the crowd that was unhurt – but his leg swelled overnight and he was bedridden for three days. 'An old French doctor lady' applied her medicine and cured him. Though he does not state her cure for a swollen leg, he does mention that she cured a woman of breast cancer 'by applying live toads to the part affected. They sucked the poisoness inflammation from the breast and cured her'.⁴¹ Whether this was French, Breton or Algonkian folklore at work is unknown.

Unfortunately, the Canadian tour ended on a sour note when, on the return trip through Montreal, non-paying observers crowded the roof and would not leave. Hutchins, the horse groom, fired a shotgun loaded with peas into the crowd and put out a young man's eye. The company had to hustle Hutchins into hiding and secret him out of the country to keep him from being killed. A lawsuit ensued, and it cost Ricketts \$800 to leave the affair behind them.⁴²

Ricketts and Durang performed representations from the plebeian end of the colonial culture spectrum. Their particular brand of performance did not shy away from non-Anglo audiences and relied more on physical prowess than on subtlety of plot. One of Durang's more curious performances was when he began a hornpipe dressed as a midget with a giant turban and during the dance transformed into the character of a full-sized black woman in a dress. So there were elements of blackface pantomime as well as the red-face performance described above. The story lines of the pantomimes they performed were narratives of imperial conquest that would appeal to those engaged in such activities. But theirs was a plebeian milieu, and therefore had a different character to the bourgeois performances more typical of the New York and Philadelphia stages that were (usually) their competition.

After returning to the US, Durang joined the Philadelphia Company of players under Thomas Wignell, touring to Annapolis and Baltimore on the company's usual circuit. Ricketts eventually left America for the West Indies with his horses and the remainder of their company, including his brother Francis and Hutchins, the old groom. Another conflict between the French and British meant that both sides were pressuring Americans to give up their neutrality, disrespecting their sovereignty and seizing their ships. The ship bearing Ricketts to the Carib-

bean was seized by a French privateer. Astutely, Hutchins hid Ricketts favourite silver mounted broadsword and pistols beneath the horse manure. The horses and lumber that Ricketts had brought to construct a circus in the West Indies were purchased by a merchant in Guadalupe who knew their rightful owner and returned them. Ricketts's circus was a success in the West Indies; brother Francis married and, after a brief stint in jail, returned to America. The final word on J. B. Ricketts was that he sold his building and horses at great profit, elected to return to England, but his ship foundered *en route* and all were lost at sea.⁴³

As for Durang, he turned to the Pennsylvania Dutch backcountry as a provider of theatrical performances. His journal has brief notes on his performances at Lancaster, Fredericktown, Hagerstown, Hanover, Carlisle, Chambersburg and elsewhere during the first twenty years of the nineteenth century. Employing family members and other players, Durang carried on much as he had during his trip to Canada with Ricketts. Displays of horsemanship combined with pantomimes, farces and even some Shakespeare delivered in German were Durang's stock-in-trade until he died in 1822.⁴⁴ His approach to the theatre, while not that of most 'legitimate' actors, was that of a journeyman. He had a trade as a dancer, horseman, actor, and all around show-person. From building sets to constructing buildings for their performances to painting scenery or even pursuing sustenance for the table, Durang was a yeoman-mechanic, a working man with a cosmopolitan background.

Durang found a living providing entertainment of a plebeian variety to German immigrants in Pennsylvania. This type of performance, which incorporated dance, equestrian performance and theatre, targeted the producing classes of artisans and yeomen. These performances were nevertheless couched within the culture of empire expanding into North America. Compared to the performances of indigenous peoples, there was little acknowledgement of the non-human world. Yet they were done to give working people, whether German, French, Dutch or Euro-American a diversion – to give them a break from the hard lives most of them led. These lives were made even more difficult because of their attempts to impose a European lifeway, developed in a feudal system that had evolved into a market economy, on an American environment that had been nurtured to support the lifeways of indigenous Americans.⁴⁵

John Bernard shared the cosmopolitan background, but not the yeoman-mechanic outlook of Durang or Ricketts; his was a bourgeois world view of hierarchy and deference that saw British drama – and his place in it – as the acme of the civilized arts. Bernard was born at Portsmouth, England in 1756, the son of a lieutenant in the Royal navy. He began acting before the age of sixteen but apparently was taken out of that profession and placed into the navy by his father.⁴⁶ When the father found that his son was aboard a man-of-war, he had him apprenticed to a solicitor.⁴⁷ But by 1773, Bernard found his way back to

the stage, where he would remain and gain approval and respect from his peers for upwards of a half century. He married Mrs Cooper (first name unknown) in 1774, and they both joined the acting company in Bath, the best outside of London. Engaging the stock roles of the bourgeois stage, he travelled to Ireland, where he worked with the renowned John Kemble in Smock Alley. Bernard then went to London in 1787 and, with his quick wit and acerbic tongue, quickly became one of the celebrated personalities there. As secretary of the famous Beefsteak Club, which had included such notables as William Hogarth, David Garrick and John Wilkes as members, he became a leading wit and man about town. Judging by the company he kept, his political views were of a 'Whiggish' inclination. Hired by Thomas Wignell of the Chestnut Street Theatre in Philadelphia in 1797, he travelled to America with his second wife, the former Miss Fisher (first name also unknown), an actress who died after ten years in the New World. Bernard first played in the United States at the Greenwich Theatre in New York, where the Philadelphia Company had set up in the summer off-season. He eventually found a home in Boston at the Federal Street Theatre, but he played in other locales and even toured the South, the Ohio Valley and Vermont in addition to Canada. He eventually returned to England in 1819, where he died in 1828.⁴⁸

John Bernard was known as a comedic actor. Oliver Goldsmith, the British playwright roughly contemporary to Bernard, had much to say about acting techniques, the state of the theatre, and what might be called a kind of performance theory. Regarding comedy, he noted that the 'sentimental' comedy, a 'new species of dramatic composition', exalted virtues over vices and 'flatters every man in his favorite foible'. The characters are always good, kind and generous, and the audience is taught to embrace their foibles and applaud their folly.⁴⁹ The dialogue was structured according to the expectations of 'polite' society, used extensively in all varieties of literature during the eighteenth century. Theatre played a vital part in defining, depicting and reinforcing what amounted to criteria for social mobility. Moreover, the playhouse itself was a public arena for people to demonstrate their aspirations to rise socio-economically by adopting and adhering to the 'code' of politeness.⁵⁰ This was Bernard's bailiwick.

The concept of 'politeness' as socio-economic criterion has a history that reveals much about the rise and development of so-called bourgeois society and class structure as it comes down to us today, and of which John Bernard was a purveyor. Anthony Ashley Cooper, the third Earl of Shaftesbury (1671–1713), dismayed by the stoic nature of classical republicanism – i.e., frugal, modest, a strong sense of public service – but supportive of the basic concept, assimilated 'politeness' into his writings on republican ideology as a kind of aesthetic.⁵¹ His writings were influential and gave that cluster of politicians known collectively as Whigs, many of whom were among the *nouveau riche* in the age of Walpole, a

reason to enjoy the fruits of liberty without being ashamed of their wealth. This, historian Lawrence Klein observed, not only explains his popularity but, in a more pertinent sense, helped to distinguish between patricians and plebians that were becoming dangerously close (some felt) to class amalgamation, especially in the emerging public sphere.⁵² Shaftesbury saw this 'politeness' as part of a cultural aesthetic that could bring individuals engaged in the acquisition of wealth, status and power to a more virtuous sense of themselves and their fellow strivers. But it also separated those who had the opportunity of 'polite learning' and the willingness to 'perform' it in public from those who had neither. The fluency of one's performed politeness was then interpreted by a majority in both groups is an indication of an individual's 'value' in a commoditized cultural environment. Facilitated by the theatre as both arena for and teacher of politeness, this cultural aesthetic helped to define a class system that both imitated and superseded the feudal society and canonized the bourgeois staple of fluid, untitled wealth.

These cultural criteria would, in theory, give rise to an informed decision-making class of 'enlightened, moral, and aesthetically sensitive landed proprietors'.⁵³ At the heart of Shaftesbury's philosophy was an assumption that this class could operate in this sensitive way.⁵⁴ But advocates of empire fail to mention that this group – then and now – consisted of those who were the proprietors and beneficiaries of an economic empire perpetrating horrific scenes on a world of horrific scenes for the sake of individual gain. Besides creating criteria for their class, 'politeness', particularly as it was reflected on the theatrical stage and a rising number of literary works, gave these proprietors the sense that theirs was a just and inevitable cause. The Hobbesian 'State of Nature' (that is, a 'state of war'), that permeated much of educated discourse was embraced by both the bourgeoisie (untitled owners of both fluid and landed wealth) and the landed aristocracy. This view manifested the assumption that the only environment in which this natural state of war could be made non-violent was by overseeing by the wise Few (in the Aristotelian sense), what had now become the abstract marketplace of empire. Yet, the reality of the African slaves languishing in the holds of South Sea Company or Royal African Company ships belies this perception of non-violence, as do the indigenous Americans treating with frontier traders and settlers. For that matter, the wars of empire between the European powers, one of the defining geo-political characteristics of the day, flew in the face of this 'politeness'. Nevertheless, because it required conscious practice, these rungs of the social ladder brought a sense of refinement and sensitivity to the participants in this imperial economic adventure. It also gave those participants the notion that they were purveyors of a superior civilization, but that they were superior to their fellow Englishmen – those who had been put in a position of having to sell their power to survive. The 'politeness' that defined the refined, as virtuous as many of its notions and sentiments may have been, was ultimately paid for

by those whose land and labor was expropriated by policies and practices that served the libertarian commercial interests of an inherently imperial economy. So to disdain the lower classes then, as John Bernard was so adept at doing, was to perform a useful function for the bourgeois class of theatregoers. It was to make it seem as though they were responsible for and deserved their less fortunate fate. In England, Americans were cast as the lower classes, even to Whigs like Bernard.

A song that underscores Bernard's views of North America was 'A New Song to the Tune of Yankee Doodle' written by his brother 'Beef Steak' Charles Hallett, quoted in part here:

[Chorus]

Yankee Doodle borrows cash
Yankee Doodle spends it
And then he snaps his fingers at
The jolly flat who lends it.

[First verse]

Ask him when he means to pay
He shows no hesitation
But says he'll take the shortest way
and that's repudiation

...

[Third verse]

Great and free Ameriky
With all the world is buying,
That she's the land of *promise*
There is surely no denying!

[Fourth verse]

But be it known henceforth to all
Who hold their IOU's, sirs
A Yankee Doodle's promise is
A Yankee Doodle's *do*, sirs.⁵⁵

If Dunlap's recollection of Bernard is any indication, the latter's ability to produce a comic story extemporaneously was one of his trademarks – indeed, it seemed to be expected of him. These stories invariably played on a perceived inferiority of the 'Other', be it a racial, ethnic or economic class 'Other'. His memoir is chock full of such tales. An example that might serve well appears in Dunlap's reflection of a story Bernard told of a tour from his days in Ireland. Entering into a converted barn in the village of Mallow (between Cork and Limerick), Bernard claimed that he and his companions were met with the following scene and conversation upon entering:

A conversation ... was going on between the gallery and the orchestra, the latter composed of a performer on the violin and one on the big drum. 'Mr. Patrick Moriarty' shouted the combiner of horse-hair and catgut, 'how are you, my jewel?' 'Aisy and impudent, Teddy O'Hoone; how are you? How's your sow?' 'Mischievous and tender like all her sex. What tune would it please you to have, Mr. Patrick Moriarty?' Mr. Patrick was indifferent, and referred the matter to a committee of females. In the mean time, Teddy began to tune up, at which another of his 'divine' companions above assailed him: 'Arra! Teddy O'Hoone! Teddy, you divil' 'What do you say, Larry Kennedy?' 'Tip us a tune on your fiddle-dee-de, and don't stand there making the cratcher quake like a hog in a holly-bush. Paddy Byrne' (to the drummer). 'What do you say, Mr. Kennedy?' 'Ain't you a jewel now to be sitting there at your aise, when here's a whole cockloft full of jontlemen come to hear you thump you big bit of cowhide on the top of a butter tub.'⁵⁶

This presence of this 'conversation' in Dunlap's memoir, recounting a story told to him by Bernard, is revealing on several levels. First, it indicates the kind of stories that were brought from real life to the stage as satire, in this case on the Irish, who became the butt of the humour and performed a perceived inferiority that justified whatever mistreatment they were experiencing at the hands of the British or Anglo-Americans. Second, one can see the storytelling style of John Bernard, and his ability to utilize this satire. This sort of approach would have been most humorous to the more genteel members of the audience but, more importantly, it perpetuates class and ethnic stereotypes. That Dunlap recalled this story nearly forty years later indicates the impact such stories had and continue to have in creating mythologies and assumptions. The stereotype replaces the person at some level, and the stereotype becomes beloved, perhaps for its quaintness, perhaps for its humour, perhaps for its ability to perpetuate a class or ethnic caste. Certainly, the stereotype was employed for its ability to draw an audience to the theatre. Here the bourgeois audience of the 'boxes' that Bernard preferred saw its perceived superiority reflected in the class and ethnic stereotypes of the stage. This was at the heart of the culture of empire – a perceived superiority.

Bernard's view of 'Yankees', for example, reveals the mythic dimensions of the Yankee character first seen in Royall Tyler's 'Jonathan'. The Yankee, Bernard observed, was a 'man of the lower orders, sometimes a farmer, more often a mechanic (the very spirit of mechanism embodied), and yet more usually a travelling salesman'⁵⁷. Calling him the 'Yorkshireman of America', Bernard attributes to him the same 'cunning, calculating, persevering personage, with an infusion of Scotch hardiness and love of wandering'⁵⁸. It would be inappropriate, Ber-

nard observes, to refer to Bostonians who move in 'the respectable circle' (his patrons), as Yankees. A curious class of 'Down-Easter' can be seen in three species, he argued: 'the swapper, the jobber, and the peddler, all agreeing in one grand characteristic – love of prey – but varying in many striking particulars'.⁵⁹

The 'swapper', Bernard tells us, is the only sedentary member of the 'tribe', whose key to El Dorado is neither 'buying, nor selling, nor growing, nor manufacturing', but exchange. This phenomenon 'shows itself in childhood, when the infant swaps its milk for marbles; and at school, when the boy swaps everything but floggings'. All worldly possessions are part of the swapping pool, and the means becomes the end. 'If poor, he exchanges to become rich; if rich, to become poor; till, having swapped wealth for want, ease for anxiety, and youth for age, he at last swaps this world for the next'.⁶⁰

Bernard continues in this vein for several pages, at which point he comes to the 'jobber':

A jobber is generally a red-faced, yellow-haired man, with light-blue eyes and a capacious mouth, dressed in a nankeen suit which was made for him when a lad, and from whose expressive restrictions his republican frame is now freeing itself at back, elbows, and waistband.

This image is one that, by the time Bernard wrote it and certainly by the time his words were published, had become so entrenched in the American psyche that many had forgotten from whence it came.⁶¹ Bernard goes on to describe the jobber in terms that would sound familiar to twenty-first century ears as a 'handyman' or 'jack-of-all-trades'.

But the most influential of the Yankee characters, because of his penchant for roaming, Bernard tells us, is the 'peddler'. This individual:

[H]as no inventive ingenuity, save in the art of puffing, and ... not the slightest taste for swapping ... To buy cheap and sell high comprehends for him the whole cycle of human knowledge; the supreme excellence of north-country stuffs is his religion; and science has taught him to believe that the world itself would not go round but to the tick of a New England clock. The same spirit which carried his ancestors into the backwoods with their train of teams and children sends him every spring on a voyage of discovery to the South. This visit is regarded by the Southern trader in the light of a visitations ... he ranks him in the list of plagues next to the yellow fever, and before locusts, taxation, and a wet spring; indeed, some go so far as to suppose that a shower of Yankees was the crowning pestilence which made Pharoah give up the Israelites.⁶²

After several pages of narrative of this sort, Bernard observes that, for the Yankee, 'swindling is still his talent, his stimulus, and local distinction'.⁶³ And to illustrate the point, Virginians point out that no Jews reside in New England, 'the competition being too great for them to exist'.⁶⁴

The impact of Bernard's Yankees should not be underestimated. This memoir was written after Bernard's return to England and completed about a year before his death in 1828. His son, W. Bayle Bernard, whose wife compiled the memoir for publication in 1887, was also an actor, but later in life turned to the pen and wrote a number of plays including *Rip Van Winkle* and others that featured a central role for the stage Yankee. It is hard to imagine that he was not influenced by his father's tales from the elder's days in America. The two late-nineteenth-century theatre historian-critics, both well regarded, who edited Bernard's memoir felt that Bayle Bernard deserved to be considered, (with Royall Tyler and others), among the inventors of the stage Yankee – a stock character in nineteenth century theatre.⁶⁵ It is the imagery of Brother Jonathan that is transformed during the Civil War into that of Uncle Sam, its origins subsumed in the collective psyche by the twentieth century.⁶⁶

But Yankees were not the only subject that deftly sailed off of Bernard's acerbic tongue. While recalling his uncomfortable coach ride from Rutland, (in western Massachusetts), to Whitehall, (on the south end of Lake Champlain), on the way to Canada, Bernard recounted the perceived ethnic qualities of the driver:

Our driver was an odd compound of Yankee, Vermonter, and Hollander; he had the small, gray, twinkling eye, and the twang and humor of the first; the 'do-as-I-please' physiognomy, and much of the honest principle of the second; while his clumsy, rotund, ungenteel figure and quiet, dilatory, methodical manners were decidedly Dutch.⁶⁷

Indeed, the 'plebeian antics' encountered on his Canadian tour were the primary subject in his recounting of that summer. At Whitehall, southern end of the ferry route across Lake Champlain, he encountered quite a diverse assemblage of westerners – farmers, tradesmen bound for a new town, merchants seeking speculations, and 'people of fortune – all sitting down at the *table d'hôte* for a feast of fish and fowl'. Bernard's account of the event provides an exemplary view of his storytelling skills, and how his view of class colours those stories:

Then suddenly arose the glitter and the clash of steel, every man seizing his knife and fork as determinedly as he might a sword and spear, and, thus armed, giving 'a note of preparation' by sharpening the former, then drawing it over the ball of the thumb to ascertain its precise edge, then holding it up in a variety of positions as if practicing some particular mode of assault, and finally exclaiming with satisfaction, 'it's plaguy good stuff!' But a noise is heard in the passage, and every eye turns to the door. It opens, and in marches the fat landlady, with a score of blacks after her, bearing the consumables. No sooner were they on the table than the onslaught commenced in all quarters, and a more terrific thing of the sort I never witnessed. Such hacking and hewing, cutting and thrusting, breaking, joint-dividing, winging and legging of geese

and turkeys, such slicing and sawing of beef and mutton, such harpooning of fish and spiking of vegetables, could hardly be imagined, much less described.

Bernard's 'mingling with the plebes' was a liking he attributed 'chiefly to my profession'. At home, those who frequent the boxes were preferable, but while abroad, 'a proportion of the pit and gallery are no less desirable'.⁶⁸ And while Bernard *mingled* with the plebes, Ricketts and Durang *were* plebes, but no less cosmopolitan than Bernard and perhaps more so.

When the Bernard party arrived in St John's, they took a stage coach to La Prairie on the St Lawrence River. Bernard describes 'The rugged Galli-Canadian who drove it was also a singular combination of the savage and the Frenchman, the former, however, so predominating that nothing was discernible of the latter but the dialect'. When the passengers grew concerned that they would be dumped into one of the sloughs the pilot had to navigate, Bernard's tale is once again flavoured by an ethnic characterization reflecting his propensity to intertwine race and class:

Why, Diable! What is de matter? Why was you 'fraid eh? Of dat littel pool! I've been in dat little pool von hundered times, and I vas no scare. You tink dere is daansher! *Eh bien*, dere vas no daansher even if de coach overturn, or de vater rone into de coach. Is not dem little hos to pool you out? Vhy vas I have do hos but to pool you out, when I drive you into de deesh! *En vérité*, I tell you, so long I can see de tail of de little hos I never tink dere is no daansher at all!

Like Durang and Ricketts, Bernard also visited the Cognawagha Indian village near Montreal. His account is strikingly different, however: 'It was ... pleasing ... to see the savage, under the influence of order and instruction, rising up towards the level of the white, and improving equally in externals and in intellect'. The Indians' communal use of horses struck Bernard as amusing. 'This may be a very good practice in Conawagha [*sic*], thought I', he wrote, 'but I doubt how it would be found to work in any other part of the world'.⁶⁹ Needless to say, the social event that characterized the circus performers' visit was not forthcoming with Bernard and Company.

When John Bernard arrived in Montreal, he learned that actor/managers John Mills and Mr and Mrs Luke Usher had established a working theatre there (the Ushers had procured an establishment in Quebec City as well). All of these individuals were known by Bernard and were there, Bernard writes, in anticipation of his own plan to develop a summer circuit in Canada when the lease expired on the Boston theatre. Bernard deemed them both beneath him in the social pecking order and he made no bones about it in his memoir. When John Mills's benefit night left something to be desired, Bernard wrote that Mills 'was obliged to come to me with a stooping neck' to ask him to play in his benefit night. Bernard did, and it got Mills 'more money than had been in the house

altogether on the previous evening'. Bernard himself, in a bit of seemingly feigned humility, states that it was due more to the wretched state of the company than to his presence. But what Bernard does not say in his memoir is that Mills and the Ushers had been playing successfully in Montreal and Quebec for two years before he arrived, although he does concede that the Ushers had 'obtain[ed] the Quebec house ... for five years'.⁷⁰ After two years of a fairly steady diet of the same company, it is reasonable to assume that a new face on the stage, one with a reputation from Boston and England, would attract a larger audience.⁷¹

Bernard immediately continued on to Quebec City and after some delay, received assistance from the British commandant at Trois Rivières in gaining the provincial capital. Once there, one Colonel Pye, the head of the Amateur Association in Quebec, took in the Bernards and helped him in presenting his bill for lectures to the governor, Sir James Craig. Luke Usher's wife, who because of her gender or her acting skills or both, seems to have been held by Bernard in somewhat higher esteem than her husband, was leading a company in this town. Bernard was welcomed into the company for six nights including a benefit. While he seems to have been treated quite graciously, he refers to the 'paltry little room of a very paltry public-house, that neither in shape nor capacity merited the name of theatre, my benefit receipted £95, besides ten guineas which Governor Craig sent me for his ticket'.⁷² The construction of a new theatre, he told his hosts, was necessary if he was to return. Colonel Pye offered some property for a theatre if Bernard would enter into partnership with Mr Usher, but 'as this lady had no other claim to such a privilege than her simple merits as an actress, I declined the proposal'. She, too, in the end, was too far down the bourgeois pecking order for Bernard. And while the 'best families' of Montreal had offered him a proposal for a theatre much more to his liking, a letter from Boston telling of his Boston partner Dickinson's return from England and subsequent desire to begin the season there convinced Bernard to return to Massachusetts after his only tour to Canada.

Some of Bernard's observations from his journey to the South are emblematic of the bourgeois assumptions of race and class in the early republic. The actor spent the summer of 1799 between Richmond and Norfolk, enjoying various excursions 'at the invitation of that truly hospitable race – the planters'. 'No class of persons', Bernard wrote, 'has been so harshly judged as the planters, the sins of the fathers having been visited upon the tenth generation'. He seems genuinely nonplussed as to how 'worthy persons whose hearts throw a mist round their brains have confounded the necessity of the present with the evil of the past'. The planters, he argues, have been among the greatest victims of this system of slavery. It is not their fault if they were born into 'an indisposible legacy'. The heart of this apologetica is contained in the following:

I do not remember a single instance of a planter defending the origin of his possessions, or one who defended the continuance of slavery by other than this single argument; that human agency is required in the cultivation of the Southern soil, while the extreme heat is not to be supported save by Africans or natives. The negro, if manumitted and paid for his labor, can live upon so little that he would not do half that is required; and, till the country becomes so populated that work shall become scarce, the white will never take his place.

This benevolent, educated and civilized race (the planters), had but one check on the profound temptation embedded in the absence of restraint, (i.e., their human property had no legal rights or recourse for wrongs done them, indeed, as property, no wrongs *could* be done them, hence the temptation): their 'goodness of heart'.⁷³

As for the slaves themselves, condescension dominates Bernard's discourse on the unfortunate group; his references to their speech presage the 'nigger dialect' of the minstrel show, and unambiguously establish them as inferior. Like the blackface minstrels that would dominate the American stage in mid-century, Bernard's stories do give African-Americans credit, sometimes a lot of credit, for their tenacity and cleverness. One story he relates in his memoir describes an exchange in Charleston, South Carolina between a free black accused of stealing – the goods were in his possession – and a judge:

Defendant: Massa Justiss, me know me got dem ting from Tom dere, and me tink Tom teal um, too; but what a dat? Dey be only a pickaninny corkscrew and pickaninny knife; one cost suspence and tudder shillin'; and me pay Tom honestly for um.

Judge: A pretty story, truly. You knew they were stolen, yet you allege as an excuse that you honestly paid for them. I'll teach you better law than that, Caesar. Don't you know that the receiver of stolen goods is as bad as the thief? You must be whipped, you black rascal!

Defendant: Berry well, massa, if the black rascal be whip for buying stolen goods, me hope de white rascal be whip, too, for doin' same ting when massa catch him.

Judge: To be sure he shall. I myself will see the punishment inflicted.

Defendant: Well, den, here be Tom's massa; hole him fast, cons'able! He buy Tom as me buy pickaninny knife and corkscrew; he know berry well dat Tom be stole from him poor fader and modder; now knife and corkscrew hab neider!

The judge, Bernard asserts, dismissed the charge. Whether true or not, this racial construction represents the early stages of working out on the theatre stage the cognitive dissonance inherent in pairing up the ideals of the American Revolution and the institution of slavery.⁷⁴ *Othello*, *The Tempest*, *Inkle and Yarico*, and *The Padlock* were all plays that contained 'swarthy' characters performed in blackface and with which the stock actor would have been familiar during these years. Bernard's depiction of African Americans in his narrative reflects his penchant for 'speaking' from the stage, whether he is on it or not. In any case,

Bernard's influence as a popular stock actor and manager on the myth-making of the early American stage is significant. This influence was particularly acute through the impact on his playwright son of his views and tales of the 'Yankee', as well as through the impact he had on bourgeois society via his gregarious parlour monologues.

So Durang and Bernard, who frequented some of the same theatre stages, occasionally at the same time, represent a stark contrast between what historians might politicize as 'Feds' and 'Antis'. But this political construction masks a deeper level of reality that says much more about what was really happening than the newspapers or the Congressional Record. Like Thomas Morton in seventeenth-century Massachusetts, John Durang and J. B. Ricketts represent, on the one hand, the path not taken: establishing relatively egalitarian relationships between people of all colours, creeds, and classes. On the other hand, their performances were part of a culture of empire, built up from the moment of transaction and the creation of capital gain. There was no room for relationships with the other-than-human world, a world commoditized by this form of economic empire. The white bourgeois culture of John Bernard was the creation, benefactor and booster of this empire that brought great wealth to certain quarters of its society. The performances of empire represented indigenous peoples as a caricature of what many of them had become after generations of conflict, encroachment, epidemics and displacement: impoverished, deracinated and angry.

Within the culture of empire itself, while theatre was patronized by the bourgeoisie, working class audiences were also a significant part of theatre culture as early as the federal period, in part because of the overlap between circus and stage drama, but also because of the afterglow of republican sentiment from the revolution. This republicanism is often mistaken by recent historians of the theatre for patrician sentiment.⁷⁵ Sometimes this may have been the case, as with General Washington, for example. But individuals like Dunlap and Durang were not patrician in the traditional sense, yet they maintained a strong sense of republican virtue and integrity in their dealings with people both in and out of the theatre. Dunlap went to his grave highly respected even though his theatrical endeavours had been a financial debacle. Theatre in the colonies had provided stock plays that reflected the interests of the bourgeoisie and painted the economic and military empire of Britain with a sympathetic brush. The movement for a larger measure of self-rule in the colonies, which turned into a full-blown revolution in the 1770s, was not only grounded in republican theory and rhetoric, but also in a drive to 'democratize' the economic empire that had been growing since the days of Henry VIII. The 'first British empire' suffered a slight setback as a result, but from the standpoint of those suffering the effects of that empire, American sovereignty – as limited as it was before 1815 – represented an intensification of imperial expansion. The rawness of empire, so well captured

a century later in Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, crossed the Appalachians and grew to the Mississippi River and beyond, culminating in the Mexican War and the fulfilment of Manifest Destiny. This rawness was unprecedented in the scope of its brutality, ethnic cleansing and racial exploitation; all of which were due many respects to the libertine character of economic empire. These depredations were not, in many if not most cases, perpetrated by a mercenary army serving economic elite. It was a grassroots movement of the citizens of Europeans and Euro-Americans. 'Nation-building' and individual material acquisition were the mantras; democratic-republicanism provided the rationale, and those who worked against it were demonized and removed, one way or another. In this context, theatre's primary function was to lighten the dark side of 'removal', a process that took on new levels of brutality as nation-building continued west of the Appalachians.

5 COLONIZING FOLK CULTURE

New styles of performance that had come on the scene in the 1790s were among the most popular in the 'West', namely melodrama, pantomime and the circus, which was beginning to include menageries and a variety of 'mixed' performances from 'tumbling' to fireworks displays. Performances in the burgeoning frontier towns of Lexington, Cincinnati, Louisville, St Louis, Mobile and Columbus, Georgia represented an amalgamation of traditional folk and imperial cultures. These performances both rationalized land expropriation and the economics of the chattel slave system; but in the case of the 'love and theft' of African-American culture born in the slave cabins and marketplaces of the eastern seaboard, there was an element of resistance as well.¹ This resistance was parlayed into an extremely popular musical genre that ultimately embraced the assumptions of empire and fed the racial mythology of the young nation. That mythology, as was seen in *Inkle and Yarico*, conflated non-whites into an inferior 'breed' that was transformed into either a 'servant' underclass, or a savage 'Other' whose lands were fair game for the expanding empire. From the earliest presence of American ships in the Pacific North-West to the rise of blackface minstrelsy in the Ohio Valley, this chapter analyses samplings from the North American performance spectrum as it evolved during the first half of the nineteenth century. Using ethnography, literary criticism and cultural analysis, the extent to which the 'colonial' culture overwhelmed the indigenous, including elements of indigenous culture among the European immigrants, can be seen. The need to partake of the market economy and turn a profit drove all other considerations aside.

Traditional indigenous cultures of North America operated on a gift economy where, rather than the commodity exchange economy of the Europeans, obligation served as a sort of money. 'Wealthy' individuals in the indigenous economy were those who had little in the way of material goods because they had gifted the bulk of their possessions to their fellow villagers. Their wealth was measured not in possessions but in the respect and obligation villagers felt toward them. This practice is consistent with the underlying theme in indigenous American cultures of appeasing the various human and other-than-human forces found in their world. Nowhere in North America was this more prevalent

than in the Pacific North-West with the so-called 'potlatch' feasts of that region. The American John R. Jewitt, a ship's metallurgist and sailor aboard the *Boston*, was taken hostage along with sailmaker John Thompson in Nootka Sound on the west coast of modern-day Vancouver Island in 1803. Jewitt's account of his experience is the best surviving narrative describing the indigenous people and their performances at this place and time.²

Jewitt and Thompson were the only survivors of an attack on the *Boston* by the Nuh-chah-nulth (Nootka) Indians. This attack was precipitated by a combination of the Indians' previous negative experiences with white traders and the offensive remarks and actions of John Salter, Captain of the *Boston*. Because of his skills with metal as the ship's armourer, Jewitt came under the protection of the man known as Maquina, considered the Chief of the community of Coop-tee. Jewitt recounted a number of performances that he witnessed during his two-and-a-half year captivity. The meaning of some of these remained a mystery to Jewitt, others such as a funeral or marriages were more apparent.

Often these performances culminated in the potlatch ceremony common to the Pacific North-West, where the headmen gave away all the belongings they had amassed in preparation for the event. Jewitt recalled one of these events that occurred two weeks after two American ships had come into 'Friendly Cove', the natural harbour of the main Nootka village. Maquina had kept Jewitt and Thompson ignorant of these ships until this potlatch performance, at which time a number of canoes came from neighbouring tribes for manufactured goods Maquina's tribe had acquired in trading with the whites. After a feast of 'whale's blubber, raw herring spawn, and cold water', preparations were made for a dance. During this dance, Jewitt reported, Maquina exhibited his young son (with whom Jewitt developed a close relationship), 'with a masque on his face drest in a most curious manner'.³ All this was but a prelude to the gift-giving, when Jewitt witnessed Maquina 'give one hundred muskets, four hundred yards of cloth, one hundred looking glasses, twenty barrels of powder, &c' to the other villagers.⁴

Early in his captivity, around the time of the winter solstice, Jewitt witnessed another Nootka performance which he described as a 'farce'. Jewitt frequently called Nootka ritual and ceremonial performances 'farces' or 'tragedies'. This performance began with Maquina firing a pistol close to his son's ear, seemingly leaving the impression among the people that his son was dead. The ritual grieving process began with villagers pulling their hair and wailing. Two men came wearing wolves' skins and carried the boy away on their backs. Jewitt and Thompson were sent away for seven days on pain of death should they return. When they returned a week later, they saw three of the villagers with bayonets pierced through their ribcages. This performance had been, in Jewitt's estimation, a ritual of thanksgiving for the bounty of the past year.

It had perhaps been a rite of passage for Maquina's son as well. It is apparent from Jewitt's narrative that he did not typically inquire into the meaning of these performances.

Jewitt saw a similar performance a few weeks later at a neighbouring village of the Aitizart people. On the morning of 8 January 1804, he witnessed 'twenty men with two arrows each run through the flesh close to their ribs and through their arms, having two men with strings made fast to the arrows that were through the flesh and pulling back as hard as they could'.⁵ That autumn, as the days shortened, another such performance occurred:

This day during the performance of the play, a boy about twelve years of age had six bayonets run into him, two through his arms, and one through each side, and two through his hips, and thus supported was carried three times round a house being lifted from the ground by the bayonets which were in his flesh: this was to me a shocking sight.⁶

Given the boy's age, it seems plausible that this was a puberty rite of passage that was perhaps performed near the winter solstice each year; such performances were common among indigenous people.

Jewitt also recorded a performance that revealed, in part, the place of bears in the Nootka world view. Bear meat was, at best, a secondary food for the Nootka, since they believed that the salmon would get jealous if humans began to eat more bear. As a result, there was a taboo surrounding the consumption salmon for two weeks after eating bear meat. This created a hardship for the consumer of bear, since salmon was by far the most plentiful food in Nootka Sound. Nevertheless, when a bear was killed, an elaborate ritual surrounded its processing. After cleaning the dirt and blood from it thoroughly, the Indians brought the bear into the chief's cabin and sat against the wall opposite his traditional seat. It was adorned with the chief's bonnet, powdered in white down and offered a plate of food. Using words and gestures, the Attendant encouraged the bear to eat. The animal was then taken out and skinned with the rest of the carcass and entrails being boiled as a stew.⁷ It seems likely, given what is known about indigenous performances, that this was intended to appease the life force of the 'bear people'; 'other-than-human persons' that, like all forces in the world, had to be appeased or somehow reckoned with. It is unfortunate that Jewitt did not record more details or enquire into the meaning of these performances to give historians an idea of what they meant to the Indians.

However, we do have an idea of what the accounts of these performances meant to whites. Interestingly, Jewitt's account became one of the more popular 'captivity narratives' of the early nineteenth century. It was ghost authored, it is believed, by a Connecticut merchant named Richard Alsop, who constructed the narrative after the style of Stevenson's *Robinson Crusoe*.⁸ Greatly expanded

from Jewitt's journal, the popularity of this version of the account led playwright James Nelson Barker to dramatize Jewitt's experience for the Philadelphia stage. While a copy of the script does not appear to have survived, a playbill has, and is kept at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. What we know from this is that the dramatization of Jewitt's journal and narrative was performed on Friday evening, 21 March 1817 at the *Philadelphia Theatre*, starring none other than John Jewitt himself. Titled *The Armourer's Escape, Or, Three Years at Nootka Sound*, this performance included dances performed 'under the direction of Mr. Jewitt' contained within five scenes of action, followed by a song, probably written by Alsop, entitled 'Song of the Armourer Boy'. The first scene tells the story of the *Boston* arriving at Nootka Sound and the subsequent attack on it, characterized by the 'treachery of Maquina and his people'.⁹ This is a departure from Jewitt's narrative, where he acknowledged that the Nootka Indians had been attacked and devastated by whites numerous times in the past. '[M]any of the melancholy disasters', he wrote, 'have principally arisen from the imprudent conduct of some of the captains and crews of the ships employed in this trade, in exasperating them by insulting, plundering, and even killing them on slight grounds.'¹⁰

The purpose of the play, however, was to first and foremost net a profit for the theatre, the playwright and Jewitt himself. In order to do this, it had to further the popular view that the indigenous people of North America were merciless savages who would slaughter an entire ship's crew for no reason without a second thought. In addition to the attack on the *Boston* noted above, there was a scene where a 'part of the crew which had landed for provisions ... [is] slaughtered by the savages'.¹¹ In depicting the performances of the 'Nootkians', they 'enter fantastically dressed, in the habits of the murdered crew, and part of the goods belonging to the ship, armed awkwardly with guns, pistols, &c.'¹² It was important that the paraphernalia of 'civilized' whites be represented as 'awkward' on the Nootkian 'savages'. At one point the neighbouring Klaizzarts tribe is represented, presented on the bill as a 'more civilized nation', primarily because their chief, Machee Uilla was the one who conveyed the message to a passing ship of the dilemma of Jewitt and Thompson.¹³

This Manichean interpretation of events in 'Indian Country' was in keeping with the popularity of the melodrama in American theatres during this period. 'Modern Jacobinical drama' was how Samuel Coleridge negatively characterized melodrama, a genre that attracted the 'criminal element', 'senseless, illiterate savages', and the 'capricious, ungrateful rabble' – quite a contrast, as others have pointed out, to Charles Lamb's 'man of genius'.¹⁴ Beginning with the adaptation of German and French melodramas for the American stage, ironically instigated by William Dunlap at the John Street Theatre in New York, Gothic romanticism came to the theatres of the United States. Gothic meant a Manichean construc-

tion of castles, secret passageways, insidious plots against the hero/heroine, purity, virtue, love and family and came to define much of the performance culture of the 'frontier' theatre. As Henry Marie Brackenridge warned the readers of his memoir published in an era when 'Romanticism' was clearly ascendant, 'Now-a-days, since truth is only sought in romance, this little volume may be thought somewhat dull and uninteresting. The reader will find nothing marvellous in its incidents, nothing improbable, nothing that is not strictly true'.¹⁵ The genre of melodrama helped Euro-Americans of the 'white empire republic' embrace a highly romanticized, even idyllic, self-identity.¹⁶

Events on the frontier demanded a romanticized identity, and this demand influenced the repertoire of the Euro-American theatre. By 1811, Native Americans of the Old North-West had retrenched their resistance to Euro-American expansion since the defeats of the 1790s culminating in the Battle of Fallen Timbers in 1794 and Treaty of Greenville the following year. The most recent aspect of this retrenchment had featured a millennial religious and cultural revitalization movement led by Tenskwatawa, or simply 'The Prophet', the brother of the Shawnee leader Tecumseh. The Prophet had experienced a life-changing vision that had brought him out of a hopeless alcoholic despair, rallying numerous followers to the cause of restoring indigenous culture and preventing further white expansion in the North-West Territory. While his brother Tecumseh travelled throughout the trans-Appalachian West organizing a pan-Indian alliance, The Prophet laid out a set of rules by which the pre-Columbian Indian world might be restored. Many of his followers were members of communities bereft of something that could be called a traditional homeland. Displaced from New York, Pennsylvania, Canada, Virginia, Kentucky and now the Ohio country, they were desperate for something that would turn the tide. In addition to eschewing all things originating in white Euro-American culture, even white dogs and cats, the Prophet's vision required new redemptive prayers and dances directed toward the earth and the ancestors. In short, in the lower Ohio valley and its tributaries, people desperate to hang onto some measure of their culture as well as their resource base altered their performances as part of that attempt. The Prophet insisted that these new dances and prayers be performed every morning and every night, which would not have been considered unusual in the Indians' world.¹⁷ From the point of view of this study, it would be accurate to say that The Prophet, like Neolin and others before him, saw Indian culture as becoming dependent on the market economy rather than maintaining the old gift economy. The performances that had included the 'other-than-human persons', who were also part of this economy, were being replaced by the ritual of the transaction and activities pursuant to that exchange. This dependence made indigenous peoples of the Trans-Appalachian West vulnerable to white expansion into their lands even as they embraced the manufactured goods and depleted their hunting

lands of game to exchange for those goods. Tenskwatawa, Tecumseh and others in the growing pan-Indian alliance were trying to reverse that process through the use of performances. The fate of that alliance in the face of Euro-American expansion is a matter of record.

Just a few miles up the Ohio River, in Kentucky, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, Euro-American society was also experiencing a change in performances as it continued its expansion at the expense of indigenous peoples. Generally speaking, white male Euro-Americans of this period typically saw themselves as defending republican virtue against all comers, be they 'Indian savages', 'Negro simpletons' or British tyrants. Sol Smith, an actor and future theatre manager who was emblematic of the Jacksonian democracy that defined much of his life, told of an incident when he was a strolling player touring western New York and Canada in 1824. Arriving in Niagara, Smith's troupe was interrupted in their performance by a group of Canadians in the room next to them singing 'God Save the King', 'Rule Britannia' and other loyalist songs. They could not make the price of admission even at half price, Smith complained, and a request for them to quiet down was met with derision, the Canadians replying that their goal was to 'drive off the d—n Yankee vagabond actors'.¹⁸ After the play, the actors went to the tavern to seek them out and "thrash them" for our American blood was up'.¹⁹ They were met by a group of Canadians reinforced by what Smith termed 'three or four boat hands – I will not call them boat *men* – some half-breed Indians, and a couple of negroes'. A brawl ensued, which was soon interrupted by a 'large, fat, red-faced Englishman' who was taken aback by the unbalanced numbers (twenty for the Canadians, 'without the niggers' and twelve for the Americans). In his characteristically pointed prose, Smith described what followed:

'You say you are going to whip the d-d Yankees' - here off went his coat - 'and you are twenty to twelve' - his handkerchief. 'These are Yankees, and you pretend to be Englishmen' - waistcoat - 'Whoever heard of an Englishman taking odds against an enemy? Stop! hear me out; what, you are determined, are you? Very well, boys, just as you please. I fought against the Yankees during the war (d—n me if I think any of *you* did!). I am a true Englishman; these Yankees are STRANGERS on our shores, and therefore entitled to kindness and protection. *You* are twenty, without the niggers; *they* are twelve. Boys (addressing us), do your best; I am on your side, and you are now a 'baker's dozen!'" The parties met. The Englishman dealt his blows right and left, and fought like a hero, as he was; and the colonists, sailors, lords, half-breeds, and negroes were routed!²⁰

This 'performance' conveniently reveals more than the unnamed plays the troupe had just performed would. The Americans pitted themselves against the motley crew of Canadian 'colonists' – Smith used the word with disdain – in a microcosmic power struggle. The fact that the Canadians included non-whites in their number, in Smith's eyes, set them on a lower level than his entourage and

their British ally. Forming an allegiance of Empire on both sides of the Atlantic, the Englishman entered the fray on the side of the Americans. As to the uneven numbers, it may be recalled that the American troupers sought out the Canadians in their own space and attacked them – a microcosmic act of empire in and of itself. The racially charged language, ‘niggers’ and ‘half-breeds’, adds to the imperial nature of this event and outlines where the boundaries of inclusion into the empire were.

A different description of this boundary is depicted in the memoir of Henry Marie Brackenridge, son of Hugh Henry Brackenridge of Philadelphia College, American Revolution and Whiskey Rebellion fame. Sent ‘down the river’ to expand his horizons as a boy (he was quite young – under 10 – to be sent so far away with relative strangers in a dangerous country), the young Brackenridge spent three years at St Genevieve in Spanish controlled Louisiana with a French-American family. It was a very unpretentious place where agriculture and religion predominated. A Kickapoo village was nearby with whom the French interacted. French and Kickapoo children frequently played together, shooting bows and arrows and learning each others’ languages. More akin to a syncretic Métis culture than a culture of empire, the environment at St Genevieve had a lasting impact on Brackenridge for which he was grateful for the remainder of his life. The French and Indians had left impressions upon him which:

[I]f not indelible, were yet sufficient to carry me a long distance through the temptations of vice and folly. I was taught to reverence my parents, to respect the aged, to be polite to my equals, and to speak the truth to every one. I was taught to restrain my temper, to practice self-denial, to be compassionate to man and beast, to receive without murmur or complaint what was provided for me, and to be thankful to God for every blessing.²¹

Here was a community relatively independent of the economic empire of the Atlantic world, where French settlers and Indians, at least, were in equilibrium. Brackenridge makes no mention of any formal performances other than strong adherence to Catholic ritual. By comparison, Sol Smith was certainly not without a strong sense of virtue, but this sense was laced with the moral centre and rhetoric of a ‘white empire republic’.

The view of theatre as a tool of empire and corruption persisted well into the nineteenth century in some quarters. As more circus and melodrama entrepreneurs appeared in response to the demands of a growing population, their reception was mixed. In Chillicothe, Ohio in 1815, an editorial condemned a recently arrived circus on much the same grounds that itinerant theatre troupes had been condemned in the colonial period:

The principle object pursued by the conductors of the Circus is to enrich themselves at the expense of others. How far they have succeeded in their design in this place

– what number of citizens have honoured them with their presence and favoured them with their support, we have not been particularly informed.

Believing that these men are prosecuting an unlawful calling – one that cannot be defended on Scriptural grounds, or on principles of sound reason and good policy, we presume the good sense of the citizens in general would lead them to treat their exhibitions with that unqualified neglect and contempt which they so justly deserve.²²

From the viewpoint taken by the present analysis, it is ironic to observe someone in Chillicothe, Ohio living on land forcibly wrested from the indigenous peoples of the region in a struggle lasting generations commenting on those who ‘enrich themselves at the expense of others’.

In the Quaker community of Sunbury, Pennsylvania, six members of a travelling circus were charged with witchcraft in the summer of 1829. They were accused of possessing:

[the] Power of witchcraft, conjuration, enchantment and sorcery and being moreover persons of evil and depraved dispositions, and as magical characters having private conferences with the spirit of darkness, did ... expose to the view of diverse and many people of the Commonwealth various feats, acts, deeds, exhibitions and performances of magic and witchcraft.

Here it seems the prosecutor must have copied the conjurers’ playbill. The indictment continues, asserting that these performers were:

Leaping over a horse through hoops, over Garters, and through a Barrel; Roman attitudes; Comic Still Dance, wherein the cloven Foot was palpably displayed; Flying by the Whole Company; Master Bacon riding upon his head instead of his Seat of Honour; wonderful Somerset from a Horse at Full Speed by Mr. Downie; Dropping from the Rope and Coming to Life, to the Great Mortification of Bystanders ... Officer and Recruit, or Double Transformation; Flip Flaps and Cobbler’s Frolic, to the evil example of all kindred spirits, for the Promulgation of the Infernal Arts, to the General Scandal and Delusion of the Human Species – to the Evil Example of all others, in like case offending and against the peace and dignity of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.²³

The dissenters were not alone in their disdain for circus performances. One of the longest running and most famous of the early show elephants was ‘Old Bet’. Purchased for \$1,000 by one Hackaliah Bailey of Somers, New York, Bailey took Old Bet on the road along with a collection of monkeys, bears and perhaps a giraffe. His efforts were very successful, and used some of the proceeds to construct a three story brick ‘caravansary’ in his hometown. On a trip to Maine in 1828, after passing through a Penobscot Indian village, a group of irate Yankee farmers waylaid the party one morning before dawn. Apparently upset about the use of exotic animals to extract money from their community, they shot Old Bet

to death.²⁴ Performances of this culture of empire, of which Bailey and Old Bet were a part, had reached their limit of reception in the north woods.

Generally, these travelling troupes – theatrical, circus or menagerie – often a combination of all three – met with rhetorical resistance but monetary support in the communities they visited. ‘Flip flaps’ and ‘somersets’ were frequently seen alongside melodramas and pantomimes such as *The Castle Spectre* or *Pizarro*. Philip Astley and John Bill Ricketts had both built theatres that facilitated equestrian shows with a circus ‘ring’ and a pit with a stage for dramatic presentations. The post-revolutionary generation born in the early years of the nineteenth century, particularly in the ‘West’, seemed more egalitarian minded regarding these performances for the most part. Even Edwin Forrest, whose portrayal of *Metamora* would make him an icon of the American stage later in the century, once travelled with a circus company in the Ohio Valley and the South. Solomon ‘Old Sol’ Smith, born in 1801 and raised in western New York, was one who shared Dunlap’s desire for theatrical purity, but was less strident in disdaining other ‘entertainments’.

In 1823, Smith’s first year of theatre management, he had been working with the young Edwin Forrest in Lexington, Kentucky. Forrest tried to get a contract with Smith even though he had previously committed to James Caldwell’s company in New Orleans. Aware of the arrangement with Caldwell, Smith turned him down but was unable to convince him to return to New Orleans. Apparently feeling jilted and reticent about returning to Caldwell’s company, young Forrest joined a travelling circus in Lexington. When Smith heard of this, ‘I called in at the Circus, and, sure enough, there was Ned in all his glory, surrounded by riders, tumblers, and grooms ... To convince me of his ability to sustain his new line of business, he turned a couple of flip-flaps on the spot.’²⁵ Eventually, Smith prevailed upon him to return to Caldwell’s theatre, where he began his rise to international fame.²⁶ What was almost unthinkable to many performers in the metropolises of American empire on the east coast was accepted as part of the business in the Trans-Appalachian West.

In the ‘infant American Paris,’ as one commentator called Cincinnati in a reminiscence of theatre in that city, one of the attractions was ‘Monsieur Grouffe, the man-monkey.’²⁷ In his internationally renowned performance in *Jocko, Or, the Brazilian Ape*, Monsieur Grouffe brought the wonders of the empire’s borderlands to the provinces and the metropole. In the ‘Grotesque appearance of the Brazilian Ape,’ Grouffe performed ‘Wonderful Feats on the Bamboo Tree and the Rope, Concluding with Hanging Himself by the Neck!!!’ When this was performed in Inverness, Scotland, the playbill noted this ‘feat that is acknowledged to surpass anything ever attempted in this kingdom.’²⁸ While the British and American Empires had their differences, they were culturally and politically

very similar. Indeed, from the perspective of the performance spectrum with indigenous performances serving as a foil, there is hardly any difference at all. Gothic romanticism, empire and the circus were conflated in this culture of empire. *The Castle Spectre* was a melodrama that was among the more frequently performed in the theatres and circuses of the Trans-Appalachian West. Written by Montgomery Gregory (M. G.) Lewis and first performed at the Theatre Royal in 1797, the title alone epitomizes Gothic melodrama. An excerpt from the Drury Lane *Prologue* captures the essence of the Gothic romanticism:

Far from the haunts of men, of vice the foe, The moon-struck child of genius and of woe, Versed in each magic spell, and dear to same, A fair enchantress dwells, Romance her name. She loathes the sun, or blazing taper's light: The moon-beam'd landscape and tempestuous night Alone she loves; and oft, with glimmering lamp, Near graves new-open'd, or 'midst dungeons damp, Drear forests, ruin'd aisles, and haunted towers, Forlorn she roves, and raves away the hours! Anon, when storms howl loud and lash the deep, Desperate she climbs the sea-rock's beetling steep; There wildly strikes her harp's fantastic strings, Tells to the moon how grief her bosom wrings, And while her strange song chaunts fictitious ills, In wounded hearts Oblivion's balm distills.²⁹

On one hand, Romanticism provided inner resistance to the excesses of capitalism reminiscent of, and heir to backwoods Puritanism and radical Whiggism. On the other hand, like Jeffersonian republicanism, which it accompanied into public consciousness, it acted to further democratize the economic empire that had come to North America. This is paralleled in the political-economic realm by the notion of 'practical republicanism' and is quite apparent in these melodramas.³⁰ The entrepreneurial qualities so valued by the bourgeoisie became entwined with the archetypal character of folktales and songs in these genres, reflecting in the cultural sphere what was unfolding in the economic sphere.

Disdain for aristocracy, if not for the bourgeois economic class altogether, is found in these performances and in the memoirs of those who practiced it. Sol Smith, for example, in the days after his Niagara encounter, was told that it was common for itinerant troupers to request the attendance of the Canadian magistrate at Little York (Toronto) to improve attendance to their performances. John Bernard, the bourgeois actor and manager from London and Boston, had built this 'bespeak' into his itinerary when he travelled to Canada. Diplomatic protocol was not in Smith's repertoire, however, and addressing the magistrate as 'Mister' rather than 'Your Excellency', he was summarily dismissed from his 'bespeak' with the magistrate. Smith's cohorts derided his republicanism, but he held to his own, saying he would never again invite any nobility to the theatre.³¹

Similar sentiments are found in the fiction of *The Castle Spectre*. The story revolves around the love affair between Angela, a humble maid who, unbeknownst to her, is heir to a sizable estate and a title; and the titled Earl Percy who, in love with Angela, presents himself to her as the lowly peasant Edwy so

as not to intimidate her. That premise alone dispenses with the aristocratic class system, making it even more radical in its 'natural environment' of England than it would have been in the US. But this depiction of humble virtue extends to a bond with the natural world. When Angela is brought to the castle of Lord Osmond, whom she does not yet realize was the murderer of her mother and possibly her father (his brother) as well, she is questioned by the Lord as to the nature of her continuing melancholy:

Oh! my good Lord, esteem me not ungrateful! I acknowledge your bounties, but they have not made me happy. I still linger in thought near those scenes where I passed the blessed period of infancy; I still thirst for those simple pleasures which habit has made to me most dear. The birds which my own hands reared, and the flowers which my own hands planted; the banks on which I rested when fatigued, the wild tangled wood which supplied me with strawberries, and the village church where I prayed to be virtuous, while I yet knew of vice and virtue but the name, all have acquired rights to my memory and my love!³²

Angela goes on the express what many Americans would have considered their natural rights – the right to rise in society according to one's ability:

And when in spite of nature's injustice, and the frowns of a prejudiced and illiberal world, I see some low-born but illustrious spirit prove itself superior to the station which it fills, I hail it with pleasure, with admiration, with respect! Such a spirit I found in Edwy, and, finding, loved!³³

Percy/Edwy, Angela's love, expresses something similar later in the play when visiting the humble cabin of Angela's stepfather:

The hut, where good-will resides, is to me more welcome than a palace, and no food can be so sweet as that which is seasoned with smiles – You give me your best; a monarch could give no more, and it happens not often that men ever give so much.³⁴

Lord Osmond, on the other hand, embodies evil in the story. Not only is he the murderer of Angela's mother (who becomes the castle's spectre); he takes Angela hostage with the intention of forcing marriage on her. In the midst of carrying out his plot, he awakens from a nightmare – an epitome of Gothic melodrama – which he then relates to his 'Negro' footman, Hassan. I relate the bulk of the text because of its melodramatic nature – it is, after all, a vision of the Christian Hell:

A mere dream, say'st thou? Hassan, 'twas a dream of such horror! Did such dreams haunt my bitterest foe, I should wish him no severer punishment. Mark you not, how the ague of fear still makes my limbs tremble? Rolls not my eye, as if still gazing on the Spectre? ... Let me not hear the damning truth! Tell me not, that flames await me! That for moments of bliss I must endure long ages of torture! Plunge me rather in the thickest gloom of Atheism! Say, that with my body must perish my soul! For, oh!

should my fearful dream be prophetic! Hark, fellows! Instruments of my guilt, listen to my punishment! Me thought I wandered through the low-browed caverns, where repose the reliques of my ancestors! My eye dwelt with awe on their tombs, with disgust on Mortality's surrounding emblems! Suddenly a female form glided along the vault: It was Angela! She smiled upon me, and beckoned me to advance. I flew towards her; my arms were already unclosed to clasp her when suddenly her figure changed, her face grew pale, a stream of blood gushed from her bosom! Hassan, 'twas Evelina! Such as when she sank at my feet expiring, while my hand grasped the dagger still crimsoned with her blood! 'We meet again this night!' murmured her hollow voice! 'Now rush to my arms, but first see what you have made me! Embrace me, my bridegroom! We must never part again!' While speaking, her form withered away: the flesh fell from her bones; her eyes burst from their sockets: a skeleton, loathsome and meagre, clasped me in her mouldering arms! ... Her infected breath was mingled with mine; her rotting fingers pressed my hand, and my face was covered with her kisses! Oh! then, then how I trembled with disgust! And now blue dismal flames gleamed along the walls; the tombs were rent asunder; bands of fierce spectres rushed round me in frantic dance! Furiously they gnashed their teeth while they gazed upon me, and shrieked in loud yell, 'Welcome, thou fratricide! Welcome, thou lost for ever!' Horror burst the bands of sleep; distracted I flew hither: But my feelings – words are too weak, too powerless to express them.³⁵

With this vision of Hell, Lord Osmond must confront the remainder of his days which, one would guess, are few. Such is the fate, the play's voice is saying, of those who do not walk the path of virtuous republican righteousness. Of course, the final tableau is one of virtue victorious and corruption vanquished. But upon closer inspection there are a number of points that reinforce the expansion of the white male empire republic.

One of the emerging national issues of the nineteenth century was whether or not slavery was to expand and whether 'free blacks' would be tolerated in newly incorporated territory. In the broader Atlantic world, the elimination of the Atlantic slave trade was being debated in Britain, where the play was written. Such a ban was written into the US Constitution but not yet in effect. When it took effect in 1808, it was apparently largely ignored in many areas. The Ohio Valley represented the dividing line between pro-slave and anti-slave – the divide between political control by the planter elite, or by a white republican electorate dominated by a *nouveau riche* who tended to be more politically involved in order to protect their interests. Blacks in the service of their masters south of the river were seen by a majority on both sides of the river as serving their appropriate function. In the North, there was the perceived threat of planters as landowners as well as free blacks. There was an inherent interest for these residents to make sure white republican or 'free-soiler' interests were protected in those parts of the country where blacks were not actual slaves and the plantation economy was illegal.

The Castle Spectre reinforces this arrangement by depicting every one of the evil Lord Osmond's slaves as black, and the one servant who works to reunite the

virtuous Angela and Percy is white (although his name is, curiously, 'Motley'). Saib and Muley, the black servants with lesser parts, are depicted as relatively loyal, but ultimately incompetent and self-serving. They were to poison Percy's ally Kenric and failed; they were put in charge of guarding Percy and he escaped. Even the elderly and overweight priest who helped Angela through the secret passage hid under their noses. The most complex of the servant characters is Hassan, Osmond's footman. Hassan is an embittered and ultimately dangerous figure whose kidnapping and misuse at the hand of European slave owners has instilled in him a hatred for whites. After Osmond relates his nightmare to Hassan, he says as an aside:

Yes, thou art sweet, Vengeance! Oh! how it joys me when the white man suffers! Yet weak are his pangs, compared to those I felt when torn from thy shores, O native Africa! From thy bosom, my faithful Samba! Ah! dost thou still exist, my wife? Has sorrow for my loss traced thy smooth brow with wrinkles? My boy too, whom on that morning when the man-hunters seized me, I left sleeping on thy bosom, say, Lives he yet? Does he ever speak of me? Does he ask, 'Mother, describe to me my father; show me how the warrior looked?' Ha! has my bosom still room for thoughts so tender? Hence with them! Vengeance must possess it all! Oh! when I forget my wrongs, may I forget myself! When I forbear to hate these Christians, God of my fathers! mayst thou hate me!³⁶

In this construction the African servants are either incompetent or dangerously embittered, and in either case are not to be trusted or included in citizenship. This somewhat subtle maintenance of white supremacy while denouncing class and aristocracy plays to the *zeitgeist* of American romanticism. The acquisition of wealth, so readily available to those who commit themselves to it, ushers in a new, more fluid class structure, just as investment in imperial projects in the British colonies had meant an expansion of the bourgeoisie. In this way, aristocracy could be plausibly denied because of the fluid structure, but money still bought power and influence. Turning once again to that Jacksonian stalwart, theatre manager Sol Smith, we find both liberal economic empire and its republican denunciation intertwined:

'People may talk of the worthlessness of money – of its being the 'root of all evil,' and all that sort of thing; I say it is the talisman which unlocks all hearts; the balsam that heals all wounds; the creator of respect, esteem, friendship, love! Without it, a man is neglected, abandoned, and scorned; *with* it, he springs into rank, is courted, fawned upon, worshiped. Talk of respect gained by a long course of good deeds, and honest actions, and just deportment! Give the veriest wretch MONEY enough, and he may discard all the virtues, and yet retain the respect and admiration of the world. Money worthless! Nonsense. I have seen it unchain a criminal; change the made-up opinion of juries; sway the judge. The priest pretends to be laboring for the good of the souls of his flock: he is not – he is laboring for his fifteen hundred dollars a year. The patriot blusters and storms at 'the powers that be' only to get the place of another, and with

it the salary. The player – but why particularize, where ALL are striving for money!
Money!! Money !!!³⁷

While this passage is written in a spirit of humour, it is the ironic humour of a Jacksonian democrat-republican. It is not a large step from this view to a denunciation of 'The Bank'. Yet, by the time the reader has reached this passage in Smith's memoir, Smith has established himself as a citizen of the white republic that excludes 'savages' and 'niggers', except as they might serve the white master. In other words, the *zeitgeist* of early nineteenth-century America is one of a white-skinned, democratic-republican empire, and is reflected and validated in its culture.

According to Smith, *Pizarro, or, Death of Rolla*, a William Dunlap adaptation of the German melodramatist August von Kotzebue's play, was one of the most popular stock plays in the Trans-Appalachian West during his career, (roughly 1815–53).³⁸ Like *The Castle Spectre*, its messages are not uncritical of some of the more egregious aspects of imperial expansion in the New World. For example, the Spanish character of Alonso, raised by the priest Bartolomé de las Casas and an opponent of Spanish depredations against the Peruvians, possesses a 'visionary enthusiasm, which forced him ... to forego his country's claims for those of human nature'. Playing off of the 'Black Legend' of the Spaniards, Kotzebue (and Dunlap) have Alonso forsake the brutality of the Spanish empire, marry a native (Cora), and help defend the Inca against this imperial intrusion.³⁹ This theme brings out Dunlap and Kotzebue's championing of compassion safely situated *vis-à-vis* the Catholic Spanish.

Gender and empire are addressed early in the play, as the treatment of women is criticized through the voice of Elvira, the increasingly ambivalent wife of Pizarro. When Pizarro orders her to leave because there is to be a council of men, Elvira exclaims:

O, men! Men! Ungrateful and perverse. O, woman! Still affectionate, though wronged. Those beings to whom in prosperity you look for added rapture, and on whose bosoms you seek for rest in adversity, when the pompous follies of your mean ambition is the question, you treat as play-things or as slaves. I shall remain.⁴⁰

A female character is made to not only mock the 'pompous follies of [men's] mean ambition',⁴¹ but to have her own voice as a woman, although the wife of a Conquistador and a member of the Spanish nobility. Later, when Pizarro takes Alonso – who he considers a traitor and mortal foe – prisoner with the intent of executing him, Elvira tells Pizarro he shall never have her again if he kills Alonso. Elvira's staunch support is validated as Alonso's virtue is on display when he is brought in chains into the presence of Pizarro and Elvira. His disdain for murderous conquest, his love of nature, of his native wife Cora and his steadfastness

in the face of Pizarro's promise to execute him paint the melodramatic scene of virtue – the same virtues represented in *The Castle Spectre* and other Gothic melodramas.

At the beginning of the denouement of *Pizarro*, Rolla, the 'Peruvian chief', has substituted himself for Alonso as prisoner of Pizarro. Elvira enters the prisoner's tent expecting to find Alonso and finds Rolla. Giving him a dagger and asking him to murder Pizarro in his sleep, Rolla and Elvira enter his tent and see that he, like Osmond in *The Castle Spectre*, is in the throes of a dark dream, talking in his sleep of murdering Alonso and gleefully hearing his agonized cries and pleas for mercy. Rolla convinces Elvira to leave the tent, wondering at his ability to sleep at all, when Pizarro is heard to mutter in his sleep, 'Away! Away! Hideous fiends – tear not my bosom thus!' Pizarro has become another corrupt soul suffering the pre-death torments of hell in his sleep.

The injustice that Europeans visited on Native Americans is the central theme of the play. This would seem, on its face, to contradict the argument being made here that theatre assuaged the horrors of ethnic cleansing occurring in the Trans-Appalachian West during this period. But one must recall that the play's setting was removed in time, space, ethnicity and nationality, enabling a sympathetic viewing of the 'natives' predicament without compromising the spirit of the imperial project. Albany, Pittsburgh, Lexington, Louisville, Cincinnati, St Louis, New Orleans and smaller theatres in between were booming 'frontier' towns profiting from the exploitation of new-found resources and markets. Indigenous peoples, and those who shared similar lifeways, were not considered to have truly legitimate interests and were swept aside. The Spanish-Inca conflict was a continent, a religion and three centuries removed.

At a performance of *Pizarro* by Sol Smith's strolling players in Columbus, Georgia in 1832, the safely exiled authenticity of indigenous performance made an uninvited entry onto the stage. The theatre in Columbus, like many buildings in the town, was a brand new one made from newly sawn lumber. Mirabeau B. Lamar, the future governor of Texas and friend of Smith, was in attendance. After the War of 1812, (fought in Georgia as the Creek War), the Muskogee (Creek) peoples were forced to cede their lands in the central part of modern-day Georgia, retaining their lands along the Chattahoochee River, which included the future site of Columbus.⁴² Muscogee County, of which Columbus was the county seat, had only recently been acquired from the Creeks after a long process of wars, civil wars, and shady negotiations. It had only just been incorporated in 1826. To lend an air of realism to his staged battle scenes, Smith hired twenty-four Creek Indian men to be the Peruvian army *vis-à-vis* Pizarro and the Spanish. The Indians were paid fifty cents and a drink of whiskey for their services. In Act II, the entry of the 'Peruvian' leader Rolla was supposed to be greeted with a shout from the offstage crew. When the crew shouted, they were joined

by the Indians, who 'raised such a yell as I am sure had never before been heard inside of a theatre'. That was only the beginning. Smith was playing the role of the High Priest of the Sun, invoking that deity to bring a blessing onto Rolla and King Ataliba of the Peruvians. As he began his invocation, he heard a low humming sound – the Muscogeans were joining in with him and soon the song 'was quite overpowered by the rising storm of *fortissimo* sounds which were issuing from the stentorian lungs of the savages; in short, *the Indians were preparing for battle* by executing, in their most approved style, the Creek war-song and dance.'⁴³ Rather than try to stop them, Smith and his colleagues simply followed the Indians' lead, after the women playing the Indian maidens 'made a precipitate retreat to their dressing-rooms, where they carefully locked themselves in'. Over the next half hour, Smith wrote, the Indians continued:

[P]erforming the most extraordinary feats ever exhibited on a stage, in their excitement scalping *King Ataliba* (taking off his wig), demolishing the altar, and burning up the sun! as for Lem [Smith's brother] and I (*Rolla* and the *High Priest*), we joined in with them, and danced until the perspiration fairly rolled from our bodies in large streams, the savages all the time flourishing their tomahawks and knives around our heads, and performing other little playful antics not by any means agreeable or desirable.⁴⁴

The stage hands dropped the curtain on the Indians, but they kept on until their songs and dances were done. Ironically, the numinous energy of indigenous performances, long associated with the rituals of life – obtaining food, marriage, birth, death – overwhelmed the 'civilized' performance of the Euro-American culture of empire.

Smith does not tell us what the performance meant to the Indians. It would be nice to know since these Creek Indians were descended from a long line of Muskogean Indians living not only near the recently founded town of Columbus, but had lived along the banks of the Chattahoochee River (now the boundary between Georgia and Alabama) and the other rivers of the region for many generations. Like Native Americans further north, they had been contending and working with the various imperial forces attendant on North America since the sixteenth century and had most recently struggled to beat back imperial encroachment during the War of 1812. Like the Pan-Indian movement led by Tenskwatawa and Tecumseh, the Creek 'Red Stick' faction had fought against both Euro-Americans and their Lower Creek cousins who had allied with the whites. The destruction of their central village Tohopeka on the Tallapoosa River spelled the end of serious resistance to the expansion of the Euro-American Empire. The ironic twist was that the lands that Colonel Andrew Jackson and the whites forced the Red Sticks to cede were lands belonging to the lower Creeks who had been the Euro-American allies. They were richer lands than the

piny foothill region where the Red Sticks lived. By 1826, white encroachment and the extension of state law over the Creek lands forced another land cession, this one including the Chattahoochee Falls area.⁴⁵ The Euro-American town of Columbus was situated near those falls, long the commercial centre of the Muskogees' Coweta Town. Because of its location, Columbus quickly became a boom town. Upon the arrival of Sol Smith's strolling troupe in 1832, it was where:

[T]he cotton of the eastern part of the Alabama cession would find its inland market, and here lived the proprietors of the banks, warehouses, wharves, and steamships required to get the staple to its destination in the metropolis of Liverpool. Before the first Indian had given his name to a census taker, the capitalists of Columbus had laid plans for assuring that the Creek lands, as well as their produce, might pay them tribute.⁴⁶

Euro-Americans took the Creek lands by force, legal manipulation and deception in order to grow staple crops for the Atlantic market economy. The reader hardly needs to be reminded that those who were tilling the soil, tending the plants, harvesting the crop, cooking, cleaning and serving those who usurped and enjoyed the wealth thus produced were chattel slaves sold on the same capitalist market as the staple crops they grew. This was the raw edge of the capitalist economic empire. In Columbus, Georgia, one evening in 1832, the white beneficiaries of empire were enjoying the melodrama *Pizarro*. Local refugees, displaced by the imperial economic process, were pathetically working as extras for four bits and a shot of whiskey – and yet their own numinous indigenous performance upstaged a performance of the culture of empire, if only briefly. The power of the Indians' authenticity, even from this remote view, even with Smith's well developed sense of humour and irony, is undeniable.

As for the intended message of the melodrama itself, the Peruvians assume the role of the forces of light; the Spanish the forces of darkness. Rolla, Alonso and Cora depict the virtues of rural life, family and loyalty; Pizarro and his followers represent the evils of tyranny in the form of the 'Black Legend' of the Spanish Catholic conquests and barbarity. In reality, the Peruvians, or Incas, lived in highly organized societies that resembled those found in European cities and nation states, and were something of an empire in their own right. North American Indians east of the Great Plains were, by contrast, villagers that had been forced into an insecure existence, moving their villages of increasingly mixed ethnic composition whenever the whites encroached upon them. This allowed Euro-Americans to more easily view them in a stereotypical light as nomadic savages who could not care for the land properly. These Indians were deemed unworthy of the most basic of rights: a right to their own land, a right ironically sacrosanct in the jurisprudence of the empire.

Contrasting the success of *Pizarro* in the Trans-Appalachian West with the lack of success of another play by Ohio immigrant Joseph Doddridge is informative. Doddridge, a minister and doctor wrote a short but conscientious meditation on the issue of brutality toward Native Americans. The play, *Logan, Last of the Race of Shikellimus, Chief of the Cayuga Nation*, is worth a brief look for its view inside the mind of an early reformer in the Ohio country. This play was, as it turned out, largely a closet play: it was rarely, if ever, performed. However, it was published and reprinted as recently 1971. Doddridge's play features a group of soldiers preparing to meet Indians in battle, and the various views of whites towards Indians are featured in the conversation. Doddridge confronts the issue of Indian rights and humanity head on. A sample of the dialogue between the characters of Captain Furious, Captain Pacificus, and the 1st and 2nd Lieutenants reveals this. At this point in the play, the military men are discussing the situation outside of Wheeling, Virginia in a scene Doddridge calls 'Wheeling: A Militia Council of War' (spelling and usage from the original):

Capt. Furious: [Why are the Indians] coming so near us?

2nd Lt.: They are still on their own ground.

1st Lt.: On their own ground! What ground can an Indian have? I would as soon apply to a buffalo for a right to the land over the river, as to an Indian. I could prove that he marked the earth with his feet, had eaten the weeds and brushed the bushes with his tail, and made paths to the salt lickns, and what has a Indian done more?

Capt. Furious: An Indian is not worthy to be compared to a buffaloe: He is a wolf, or bear, that lives upon the destruction of everything about him. He is a beast of prey.

2nd Lt.: They have at least the right of possession of the country. Providence placed them here, long before the white people knew anything of this quarter of the earth.

Capt. Furious: That is true, and if they had been worthy of its possession, they would have been continued in it; but they are Canaanites, whom Providence has doomed to utter extermination.

2nd Lt: I am no Moses, and am therefore not authorized to pass this dreadful sentence upon them.

Capt. Furious: Neither am I a Moses; but I am a Joshua to execute the decree of their destruction, and although I cannot command the sun and moon to stand still; yet if my companions think as I do, this very day shall be long enough to finish some of them.

Capt: Pacificus: Perhaps we had better take a little time for deliberation on this weighty concern. The Indians are not likely to leave their present encampments shortly, and we shall soon find means to discover their intentions.

Capt. Furious: What shall we wait for the tomahoc and scalping-knives of the Indians to convince us of their bad intentions! Are you not aware that they claim the very ground on which they stand?

[Discussion of atrocities on both sides, including those of the Paxton Boys in Pennsylvania.]

1st Lt.: The Paxton Boys did right. An Indian ought to be killed, he is naturally a murderer, and if not at war, it is only because he is chained down by fear.

[More discussion of the Indians' intent.]

Capt. Pacificus: Surely you will not kill women and children. This would be not only inhuman, but dishonorable.

Capt. Furious: I will kill all, nits will be lice, they have killed the traders and now blood for blood. No mercy ought to be showt them.

[Discussion of whether or not to attack without a declaration of war by government.]

1st Lt.: The criminal justice of our country, for killing Indians! WE are not afraid of that! All the sheriffs, magistrates and constables in the country could not take one of us. If they should attempt it we would soon shew them the effects of club law.

[Discussion of Indian retaliation. The militia votes on how to proceed, all vote to kill the Indians. The last word in the play is reserved for Shahillas, Chief of the Ottaways.]

Shahillas: The whites will destroy us. We have had our day, our night is at hand. The white men will have theirs, and then some strong nation will bring the dark night upon them.⁴⁷

Doddridge's willingness to lay the case out in such stark terms before the potential audience perhaps doomed the play to relative obscurity – it is probable that he knew it would not be played and meant it as a kind of pamphlet. Paralleling publications such as *Freedom's Journal* and later, William Lloyd Garrison's *The Liberator*, Doddridge's play confronts the status quo and gives voice to those who found Indian-hating to be a perversion of humanity. Nevertheless, at the end of the play, 'Shahillas' acknowledges a seemingly ineluctable fate for the Indians, although he observes that the cycle of power will turn on the whites eventually. Unlike the popular play *Pizarro*, the Native Americans were not safely removed in time, space and cultural context. *Logan* elicits the rawness of the conflict that was on the minds of every person in the Trans-Appalachian West and called attention to the brutality of the ethnic cleansing process. This was too real, too raw and too true for a popular audience that ranged from those whose silence condoned empire to those advocating the behaviour Doddridge was questioning.

Moving back across the spectrum of American myth-making, John Augustus Stone's *Metamora, Last of the Wampanoags*, served to assuage the cognitive dissonance of the frontier's ethnic cleansing more in line with the psychological needs of the white empire republic. What was needed was a rationale, vindication and validation for the democratized empire-republic. This play provided

that and more. As a result, it made the illustrious career of actor Edwin Forrest, who had commissioned a contest for an American themed play and this was the winner. It became one of the century's most popular theatrical works. In many ways, *Metamora* defined an era of American history spanning the generation that lived between the election of Andrew Jackson in 1828 and the appearance of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* in 1852, which revised and updated the conflicting forces in the Euro-American psyche. Indeed, when seats remained empty, theatre managers like Sol Smith and Noah Ludlow would stage *Metamora*, preferably with Forrest in the lead role, to bring in receipts.⁴⁸

In the play, *Metamora* was a caricature of the historical Wampanoag leader Metacom or King Philip. He was a metaphor for the 'soul' of the North American continent – a torchbearer, as it were – who passed his flame to Euro-Americans via this stage representation. 'I have been on the mountaintop', *Metamora* told his audience, 'where ... the Great Spirit passed by me in his wrath.'⁴⁹ On this mountaintop, this figment of the Euro-American mind had taken up the spirit of nature through conquest, stating, 'I had slain the great bird [thunderbird?] whose wing never tires, and whose eye never shrinks; and his feathers would adorn the long black hair of Nahmeokee', (*Metamora's* wife). *Metamora* possessed the spirit of America through his conquest of nature, according to this mythic construction. 'The Wampanoag ... owns no master, save that One who holds the sun in his right hand.'⁵⁰ At a key moment, as his demise approaches, *Metamora* passes one of these feathers – a metaphor for the spirit of the American place – to the most pure of the white newcomers: the play's heroine, Oceana. Possessing a name drawn from the Whig heritage of the British and Euro-American empires, Oceana receives the feather and passes it on to the virtuous artisan/yeoman Walter, her beau.⁵¹ In case the formation of the St Tammany societies and Mrs Hatton's play in the 1790s had not made the point clearly, *Metamora* cemented the passing of the torch to white, male America as the possessors of the continent.

In *Metamora*, the democratizing aspect of the Euro-American Empire is unambiguously seen through the characters of the benevolently bourgeois Sir Arthur and the plebeian Walter. Their conflict with the more aristocratic Fitzarnold and Mordaunt would not have been lost on the Jacksonian audiences and performers of the Trans-Appalachian West. The plebeian Walter's snub of the aristocrat Fitzarnold is symbolic of the Euro-American plebeian rejection of the European class structure. Walter's threat of violence against the British aristocrat is not too strong an expression given that it was lived out in two wars within living memory of many in the audience. Indeed, the sentiment is captured in real life by Sol Smith's Canadian bar brawl described earlier.⁵²

The unbridled pillaging of the natural resources of North America was entering unprecedented levels as Euro-American colonizers passed through the

Cumberland Gap, over the Alleghenies, down the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, and north to the Great Lakes. While western 'boatmen' such as the larger-than-life Mike Fink espoused the crude virtues of his 'race', Forrest's audiences were hearing Metamora's expression of the Noble Savage's virtue in a land the Euro-American colonizers felt destined to inherit and exploit. Bravely, the Wampanoag caricature uttered: 'The good man's heart is a stranger to fear, and his tongue is ready to speak the words of truth.'⁵³ He goes on to tap Christian rhetoric to defend harbouring white fugitives fleeing an unjust prosecution. By comparison, most whites were depicted as corrupt:

Do you not set a snare for [the Indians] that they may fall, and make them mad with the fire water the Great Spirit gave you in his wrath? The red man sickens in the house of the palefaces, and the leaping stream of the mountain is made impure by the foul brooks that mingle with it.⁵⁴

Metamora's virtue is cast against the foil of the British aristocrat's greed. The decline of the indigenous populations were associated with 'progress' and 'development' of the land through clearing and ploughing, concepts and practices that were both unbridled and unquestioned in the white world.

The Noble Savage – 'Natural Man' – passes his virtue to the Euro-American colonists, symbolized in the gift of the feather to the virtuous Oceana, and is combined with the democratic virtue of Walter to create a new race – the exceptional American. This exceptional American, the folkloric, mythical embodiment of virtue, would eventually be institutionalized in academe by historians such as George Bancroft, John Fiske, Frederick Jackson Turner and, more importantly, embraced by the citizenry through the national mirror of the theatre stage, the silver screen and television.

A similar situation obtained with regard to the 'involuntary colonists', the African Americans, both slave and free. Admitting their equality was taboo; maintaining an imperial upper hand using elements embedded in Euro-American culture was the rule. Whites, as has been noted, had performed in blackface for some time, both on the stage and in the street, with the burnt cork possessing a variety of meanings. Beginning in the 1820s and accompanying the rise of the romantic conflation of folk and imperial culture in the United States, blackface performance came, in large measure, to perpetuate stereotypes regarding blacks. The culture of empire that was permeating and modifying folk culture in the aftermath of the American Revolution added solo blackface performances to its repertoire by the late 1820s – a development that paralleled the rise of the circus and melodrama in the United States. Indeed, many circuses added minstrel shows to their repertoire of equestrian feats, gymnastics, menageries and melodramatic plays.

Melodrama, the circus and blackface performance were all coming together in Noel Ludlow's exertions in the South in the late 1820s. Ludlow, Sol Smith's

future partner and veteran stock player from the Samuel Drake company, worked toward the erection of a building in Louisville that would 'answer for either dramatic or equestrian performances, or both'.⁵⁵ Following the lead of Philip Astley in London and John Bill Ricketts in Philadelphia, Ludlow's plan included removable seats in the pit that would permit the area in front of the stage to be converted into a ring for the horses. Thomas Dartmouth 'Daddy' Rice, the creator of the 'Jim Crow' character that led to the century's blackface minstrelsy craze, had been a player in Ludlow's itinerant troupe when the theatre in Mobile went up in flames taking their wardrobe, music, and a building in which Ludlow had one-half interest – ten days after Ludlow had let their insurance policy lapse.⁵⁶ The theatre burned early Sunday morning, 1 March 1829. On Monday, a local committee met and resolved to assist in its rebuilding. Ludlow, who was married with four children and had just lost his life's investment, threw himself into the work. His troupe went off to play in Montgomery to raise funds, but by 2 May the new Mobile theatre was ready to open. They played into the summer taking benefits for every member of the troupe as well as the carpenters who were highly praised for their rebuilding work. It was at the end of this benefit period that H. Purdy Brown arrived in Mobile with his equestrian performance troupe; which is to say, his circus. Ludlow states that they performed melodramas, one of which was *El Hyder*.⁵⁷ *El Hyder*, on the other hand, had been performed as early as 1818, and was an 'extravaganza' set in India, the other end of the British Empire. Subtitled *The Chief of the Ghaut Mountains; a Grand Eastern Melodramatic Spectacle*, this play calls out for some attention in the present study. The setting is India; there is a civil war between a corrupt usurper (Rajah Hamet) and his virtuous challenger (El Haber) who is accompanied by his wife and son. The play calls not only for horses but an elephant, which would have been a scarce item in Mobile, Alabama in 1829. The presence of British sailors in support of El Haber, and the fact that it was being performed by an itinerant theatre troupe in Alabama in the early days of the expansion of the plantation complex into that region all lend support to the even itinerant troupers and circus performers in peripheral areas of the early republic were purveyors of a culture of empire.

The Manichean characters of *El Haber* are typical of the melodrama genre, as are the threats to the innocent Zada and Cherriden, El Haber's wife and son. The British sailors, Mat Mizen and Harry Clifton play a role in rescuing these innocents from the evil Rajah Hamet. British (i.e., 'white') superiority is asserted when Hamet's harem guard, Abensellah, surrenders to them at the sight of a brandished pistol. Mat Mizen finds this amusing and underscores the cowardice and inferiority of the Indian:

Ha! ha! ha! why, then, what a precious soft Tommy chap you must be. Ha! ha! ha! who the devil would have thought you could have been so easily gulled! What! did you think I was in earnest, and going to smash your head-rail? Bless you, it was only

in joke. We Englishmen know too well the blessings of liberty – their houses are their castles, and never will they infringe on the rights of others, which they would die to maintain themselves. Give us your hand, my hearty, and when next you meet an English sailor, remember, he is never to be dreaded but in battle.⁵⁸

Abensellah is clearly depicted as a typically inferior ‘native’ and the sailors are seen as a pair of virtuous, happy-go-lucky yeomen like those who captured André in Dunlap’s play of the 1790s.

The virtue of the English is repeated near the end of the play as the combined forces of El Haber and the Englishmen assail Hasem’s stronghold:

Aye, to be sure – we British lads espouse the cause of all who are oppress’d: each true born Briton echoes forth the cry of freedom, and while a sword, a man, or guinea lasts, surrounding nations shall all allow, that England is the first to combat in the cause of liberty.

The battle scene at the end is the ‘extravaganza’ part of the performance with cannon, ramparts, various previously introduced characters depicted in success or victory depending on where their allegiance lay. At the end, with the prince hoisted upon a shield, the British flag is seen waving and ‘liberty’ triumphant.⁵⁹ El Haber has few lines for a protagonist, but he represents the epitome of masculinity, bravery, as well as martial qualities. As noted, he and his wife and son provide the familial ideal typical of this combination of folktale and imperial rationale.

Like Columbus at the Chattahoochie Falls or New Orleans at the mouth of the Mississippi, Mobile had been an *entrepôt* from pre-Columbian days. Known also as Maubila or Mauvila, it was also home to the Mobile branch of the Muskoghean peoples and was destroyed by Hernando de Soto’s army in 1640, although it was apparently inhabited again by 1675.⁶⁰ The European infrastructure dated from 1702 when it was the colonial capital of the French colony of Louisiana.⁶¹ As intermittently part of colonial France, Spain, Britain and the US, as either part of Louisiana, West Florida or, by 1829, the state of Alabama, Mobile had witnessed a long parade of imperial interests passing through her strategic harbour. By the time of this performance, again like Columbus, the Muskogheans had been largely conquered and their villages either destroyed or consolidated. Some had already left for ‘Indian Territory’ in the West. The capitalist merchants and planters who paid the admission to Ludlow’s and Brown’s extravaganza likely saw themselves in the jovial, brisk and free flag-waving sailors Mat and Harry, perhaps fantasizing themselves as the larger-than-life El Haber. Meanwhile, their newly bustling port town was being fed by wealth produced by slave-grown cotton from the Blackbelt region upstream. Humble as it may have been by later standards, this was a performance of, by, and for an economic empire that, rhetoric aside, had little compunction about expropriating the land

and labour of others, at times with a publicly funded military force. Furthermore, this was an empire that employed the rationale of virtue and the social mobility of a libertarian economic environment to hide the ultimately predatory nature of this expropriation.

Ludlow buttonholed Brown near the end of the benefit series at Mobile's new theatre and asked him to join forces in presenting theatre and circus extravaganzas in the Ohio Valley the coming season. Ludlow was convinced this would be a moneymaking combination. Brown agreed to meet Ludlow in Louisville in a few weeks, giving the latter time to secure an appropriate space and for Brown to play his circuit in Mississippi, Tennessee, and southern Kentucky. Ludlow sent his carpenter, Mr McConkey, ahead to secure a lot with a suitable structure or the materials to build such a structure. McConkey acquired a suitable location and proceeded to construct a building that would function for the planned performance combination. However, after two weeks of performances in Cincinnati in July, Brown backed out of the deal, much to Ludlow's chagrin. Brown, it seems, was not as optimistic about the combination of theatre and circus as was Ludlow and elected to stick to his own circuit and head back east for the season. He would, however, soon return to the Ohio Valley and the south-west, and the circus would only increase its frequency in the Trans-Mississippi West in the coming years.⁶²

Sol Smith was also a believer in bringing in the circus if the theatre receipts were lagging. After the Mobile theatre had burned, Smith wrote Ludlow telling him that any room that could bring in \$1500 in receipts was acceptable; if people complained maybe 'they will build us a new theatre'. He added that the city could build something for \$5000 and let it to a Circus or Ferry for fireworks. Indeed, in 1839 Smith tried his hand at the circus as he grew tired of competing with them. He wrote Ludlow in that year that he was going to try it out in Lafayette, Louisiana. He became bored with circus management however, and did not stay involved for long.⁶³

T. D. Rice apparently left Ludlow's troupe around this time, reappearing in the historical record as part of Sol Smith's travelling troupe playing at the Columbia Street Theatre in Cincinnati in the spring of 1830. The impact of Rice on the cultural history of empire as the blackface song-and-dance performer 'Jim Crow' is too great to ignore. Literary scholar W. T. Lhamon, Jr. has made a substantial contribution to research on 'Jim Crow' Rice not only through his monograph on blackface performance, *Raising Cain*, but his published collection of primary sources entitled *Jump Jim Crow*. This book includes previously unknown and unpublished songs, plays and speeches written by Rice that he performed as Jim Crow. This collection is invaluable in analysing the presence of both an imperial culture and a folk-rooted dissent directed at that culture in the genre of what was called at the time 'Ethiopian Delineators', later known simply as a 'Nigger Show'.

These materials combined elements of imperial culture – performances designed to draw receipts – by employing folk idioms that appealed to many different audiences for different and often conflicting reasons.

When Rice joined with Smith in Cincinnati after leaving Ludlow's troupe in the South, Rice was reportedly 'busy composing and arranging his *Jim Crow* songs which afterward raised him to the topmost wave of popularity, both in this country and England'.⁶⁴ Ludlow observed that Rice's talent 'consisted in his great fidelity in imitating the broad and prominent peculiarities of other persons, as was evident in his close delineations of the corn-field negro, drawn from real life, and for which he was justly celebrated in the latter portion of his career'.⁶⁵ Rice had been influenced by street musicians in New Orleans that he had met while with James Caldwell, the same Caldwell who had Edwin Forrest under contract in 1823. Rice had interacted with New Orleans artists like Picayune Butler, George Nichols, and Old Corn Meal. The theatre world of the Old South-West was a small one, and all of these actors and managers worked with one another at various times. These performers variously played theatres and circuses, including H. Purdy Brown's Circus, and were known for their imitations of blacks, with the exception of Old Corn Meal who *was* black and who never left New Orleans.⁶⁶ By May of 1830, having studied and learned from these men and others and, as Ludlow pointed out, having a unique talent for imitation, the itinerant, mediocre actor Rice was ready to 'Jump Jim Crow'. The first known advertisement of his Jim Crow act appeared in Louisville newspaper on 22 May 1830.⁶⁷ This act would change the face of American culture. Unlike the ideologically-oriented American culture William Dunlap and others had sought, Rice's act was a spontaneous and subtle questioning of power manifested, as Lhamon writes, in the 'slashing' of an 'extravagant and wheeling stranger'. The subdued and obedient 'Sambo' – as seen in characters like 'Mungo' in *The Padlock* – stepped away from his subservience and into the untamed shoes of Jim Crow.⁶⁸ The distance from Mungo to Jim Crow is captured in this verse:

I am like a piece of india-rubber,
And weigh just three pounds and an ounce,
And de more you press me down,
De higher I will bounce.⁶⁹

This resistance to power and oppression resonated with working class audiences during the 1830s and '40s, when controversy over the Second Bank of the US evolved into westward expansion and Manifest Destiny.

The significance of the Jim Crow character is not only that this character was pregnant with a stereotypical concept of racism and white supremacy, but that he was also pregnant with a inter-racial democratic impulse that continues to haunt the dreams of the powerful.⁷⁰ Lhamon's collection of Jim Crow lyrics,

plays and speeches from both sides of the Atlantic – Rice toured England and Ireland in the second half of the 1830s – provide insight into this unruliness. Rice, and for that matter copycat performers, wrote and rewrote lyrics to the classic Jim Crow theme that began:

Come listen all you galls and boys
 I's jist from Tuckyhoe,
 I'm goin to sing a little song,
 My name is Jim Crow
 Chorus:
 Weel about and turn about and do jis so,
 Eb'ry time I weel about and jump Jim Crow.⁷¹

African American folk elements fill these lyrics, as does the 'Mike Fink' keel boatmen lore of the Trans-Appalachian frontier, both of which represent an unruliness that harkens back to the Stamp Act riots and resistance to press gangs on the streets and wharves of Boston in the 1760s. But in Jacksonian America, the rhetoric was laced with African American dialect:

I sit upon a Hornet's nest,
 I dance upon my head,
 I tie a Wiper [viper] round my neck
 And den I goes to bed
 Dere's Possum up de gumtree
 An Raccoon in de hollow,
 Wake Snakes for June bugs
 Stole my half a dollar.⁷²

The blackface mask, in these early days of Jim Crow, provided a screen for calling into question the social order, politics and general assumptions of the day. It was a modern version of the traditional folk culture's 'carnival,' where society was turned upside down, if only briefly. In this selection, there was a concern about blacks in the North losing jobs to white criminals whose new-found honesty would put the legendary Chief Constable of New York Jacob Hays out of work:⁷³

I'm berry much afraid of late
 Dis jumping will be no good.
 For while de Crow are dancing,
 De Wites will saw de wood.
 But if dey get honest,
 By sawing wood like slaves
 Der'es an end to de business,
 Ob our friend Massa Hays.⁷⁴

The ethnic, racial and class based aspects are central features of the empire invading the Trans-Appalachian country in the early nineteenth century. Free blacks and slaves, displaced Indians and poor whites represented a growing ‘mudsill’ class, or *lumpenproletariat* that had little to gain from the empire’s libertarian economics. Doors open to white males who were willing to ply the trade winds of capitalism offered few alternatives – it was empire, poverty, or resistance. The early Jim Crow material offered a type of resistance that, from a bottom-up perspective, would have rung true:

I’m so glad dat I’m a niggar,
 An don’t you wish you was too
 For den you’d gain popularity
 By jumping Jim Crow
 Now my brodder niggars,
 I do not think it right,
 Dat you should laugh at dem
 Who happen to be white.
 Kase it dar misfortune,
 And dey’d spend ebbery dollar,
 If dey only could be
 Gentlemen ob colour.
 It almost break my heart,
 to see dem envy me,
 An from my soul I wish dem,
 Full as black as we.
 What stuff it is in dem,
 To make de Debbil black
 I’ll prove dat he is white
 In de twinkling of a crack.⁷⁵

By the 1840s, this mudsill culture that spread throughout the realm of empire – British and Euro-American – had a decidedly darker hue. These verses are from a Jim Crow broadside titled, on one side, ‘Jim Crow, Still Alive!!!’ and on the other, ‘Dinah Crow’, two songs probably meant to be sung in tandem. This excerpt is from the ‘Jim’ side, and expresses empire from the view of a ‘lowly’ soldier:

I listed in de army
 An sarve Uncle Sam,
 Any other service
 Aint worth a damn.
 ...
 At New Orleans town
 De British went to teal,
 But when dey seel ol Hickory,
 Day took to dere heel.

...
 Lord how dey cut dirt,
 An didn't stop to trifle.
 For dey didn't like de sight
 ob de dam Yankee rifle.

...
 I'm a touch of the snapping turtle,
 Nine-tenths of a bull dog.
 I've turned the Mississippi,
 All for a pint of grog.
 ...⁷⁶

The Jim Crow phenomenon, like most challenges to power, was eventually swallowed up in the larger culture of empire as it evolved into: 'Minstrelsy'. The folk elements of resistance that Jim Crow expressed became caricatured into a kind of commercialized conformity by 1840 in the blackface minstrel show. By 1848, when the minstrel show – not the early Jim Crow shows – had become a staple of American popular culture, Frederick Douglass's comment on whites in burnt cork was that they were 'the filthy scum of white society, who have stolen from us a complexion denied to them by nature, in which to make money, and pander to the corrupt taste of their white fellow citizens'.⁷⁷ Since the rise of the African American civil rights movement of the last forty years or so, this has been the more widely accepted view of minstrelsy. But for more than a century prior to that, popular views were much more positive. This is captured in Carl Wittke's preface to his 1930 monograph on minstrelsy, *Tambo and Bones*: 'Happy memories of the burnt cork semi-circle, gathered during barnstorming student days, are responsible for an abiding interest and a real love for the old-time minstrel show'.⁷⁸ This latter blackface genre was the result of an acculturation process that operates on cultural elements opposed to empire, as some of the rebelliousness of the early Jim Crow material was. But by the 1850s, the internal forces tearing at the fabric of the Euro-American Empire disrupted the acculturation process as once again, one empire was split into two opposing factions.

6 EVENING STAR MEDICINE MEETS UNCLE TOM

For the Pawnee peoples, whose villages were in modern-day central Nebraska, their year of ritual performances began just before the spring equinox and coincided with preparations for the annual planting of crops. The way their earth lodges were constructed enabled the priest who oversaw this performance to observe the stars through the smoke hole from his assigned seat on the west wall of his lodge. The stars were, to the Pawnee, their ancestors, and around the first of March two small stars called the 'Swimming Ducks' appeared, heralding the coming of warm weather and telling the animals to wake up. They told the Pawnees to expect sheet lightning and thunder, the 'other-than-human persons' who came from the south and signalled that it was time for the ritual performance of the creation.¹ Having recently returned from their winter bison hunt, this was how the seasonal cycle of their village life began anew each year.

In these performances, the Pawnee cosmos was recreated within the lodge designated for the purpose. Even the smallest of objects in this and most other Pawnee performances were loaded with metaphorical meaning. In this case, the sacred lore of the Evening Star medicine bundle – a collection of metaphorically-charged objects – guided the priests and their helpers through the performance. For example, the Evening Star bundle contained two ears of corn that represented the staple food of the people, owl skins that represented the watchfulness of the chiefs, hawk skins representing the ferocity of the warriors, flint that represented fire, sweet grass provided incense used to elicit recollections of past performances and several paints that symbolized the powers of the four cardinal and four semi-cardinal directions. All was spread on a yellow buffalo calf skin that represented the bison herds.

In this first performance of the Pawnee year, the priests were charged with singing the recreation of the world by recalling the Pawnee creation myth. Using gourd rattles as an accompaniment, this would have had its equivalent in the white Christian world in a priest or pastor singing the book of Genesis – but with one important difference. The Pawnee creation story included the immediate environment of their world; the corn, the bison, the clouds, the plains storms

and numerous plants and animals that were intimate to their world. This experience is not found in the world of commoditization and exploitation. The Pawnee and other indigenous peoples knew their fellow creatures on a physical and emotional level nearly unknown in colonial or modern society. There was a deep and profound admission that they would not be able to survive were it not for these plants and animals and this admission was part of their performance life.²

It was also important to recount this story because it told how the people came together from scattered bands and formed the powerful Pawnee nation centred on the Skiri band village. It also separated the non-priest leaders, or chiefs, from the priests, keeping the peace between the various bands and separating what in white terms might be called 'church and state'. The first chief to suggest this course of action was remembered, as was his sacred bundle that originally included his skull which had long since disintegrated and been replaced by another. Known as the 'Skull Bundle' or the Bundle of the Wonderful Person (*tsahiks-paruksti*), it figured prominently in a number of ceremonial performances. The creation stories of the other sacred bundles were also part of this performance, underscoring the diffusion of authority both in the world and among the Pawnee. There was also a Morning Star bundle, and a bundle for each of the semi-cardinal directions that each sponsored other ceremonial performances.³

While the Pawnee considered themselves and their fellow creatures descended from the stars, they also had a healthy regard for the powers of 'other-than-human persons' who resided 'below-ground'. Unlike many other indigenous groups in North America who sought visions to acquire a personal guardian from the unseen world that would often take the shape of an animal, the Pawnee usually sought guidance from the animal world. However, for certain members of Pawnee society who took part in the 'animal lodge' tradition, guidance *was* sought from individual animal species. Anthropologist Gene Weltfish described the difference between the chiefs, priests and doctors who developed these relationships with the animal lodges:

The chief and the priest to whom the cosmic powers spoke in visions, were men of reason who spoke out clearly on what they thought, while the doctor who communed with the animal world had a slow, deliberate, introspective mien, seldom if ever making clear pronouncements. The animal cults all had their origin in the experience of an individual man who in despair had reached out to the universe at large and received a vision from an animal who was ready to intercede for him and help him work out his problems. He had received special knowledge that would help him cure the sick through the properties of the plants and other curative procedures. In addition to this kind of knowledge, the animal also transmitted to his protégé the power of hypnotism and suggestion that gave him control over animals and other people and, if he was skillful enough, over the enemies of the tribe.⁴

The animal lodge doctors identified themselves with actual physical locations that corresponded to locations in the 'unseen' world where they had received their 'medicine'. One should not take this to mean 'supernatural', although those of us from the Judeo-Christian and Enlightenment traditions might be tempted to do so. The fact that these locations also existed in the physical world, meant that they were a part of nature and not *supernatural*. These sites were called *rahurahwa:ruksti:'u*, roughly translated as 'being holy ground'. Animal lodges were the 'below-ground' equivalent of the Morning and Evening Star associations above ground, and therefore among the most important sacred sites of the Pawnee.⁵

Scholars believe they have identified a number of these animal lodge locations and associated each with a mythical history. These include locations like *Pa:haku* (Mound on the Water), a bluff on the Platte River near Fremont, Nebraska. Another is *Kicawi:caku* (Spring Mound), believed to be located just below the confluence of the forks of the Solomon River in north-central Kansas. It was a natural artesian spring that was used by whites as a spa until the Glen Elder dam was constructed, submerging *Kicawi:caku* under the resulting reservoir. The symbolism of this reservoir drowning a sacred location of the indigenous people is notable and a metaphor for the cultural conquest of North America. Another animal lodge location that scholars tentatively believe they have identified is *Ahkawata:ka* (White River Bank), a loess bluff⁶ on Cedar Creek of its confluence with the Loup River.⁷ These animal lodges underscore the point that in indigenous performances, and in the mythical world generally, the local landmarks, fauna and flora are given an equal presence in human consciousness.

These animal lodges and their affiliated doctors were involved in most indigenous performances throughout the seasonal cycle. But twice a year, each time before the majority of the villagers left on their semi-annual bison hunt, they were given centre stage. Anthropologist Gene Weltfish, who lived with the Pawnee intermittently over a period of many years, dubbed these performances 'the Doctors' Grand Opera'.⁸ In 1932, Weltfish recorded the recollections of an 1867 performance of this event by her aging informants. The level of detail is striking given the fifty-five year interim. This particular performance was overseen by two doctors, Big Doctor and Pipe Offering, who were two of the most respected doctors in the village.⁹ This performance typically occurred in the lodge of one of the doctors. The bed platforms were uprooted, the lodge was smudged (smoked), both as part of the ritual cleansing and to drive out the fleas. Booths were constructed for the various animal cults along the walls. While this happened, the lodge's inhabitants moved in with neighbours and relatives for the duration. All preparations were done with a combination of ceremonial performance and informality. For example, when the doctors were notified that it was time to prepare the lodge, two messengers wearing buffalo robes and car-

rying eagle-wing fans trotted through the village and visited the lodge of each doctor. They entered, and sat at the eastern entrance with their fans in front of their faces. Residents were expected to whisper into their right ear asking what it was that they wished. They would then whisper in response that the doctor was to come to the Doctor Lodge right away. They continued this pattern until all twenty-six doctors, the total in 1867, had been notified and had arrived at the Doctor Lodge. They were greeted by Big Doctor who then gave a brief welcoming address paraphrased by Weltfish and her informants:

Tonight we are going to practice our first songs so that we can send the birds, the winds, and everything on their way south for the coming winter. I have sent men out to see about willows for our booths. They report that there are good trees for us. I wanted you to know that in a few days we are going to start to set up the lodge. Now the leaves are turning yellow and they are falling. This is the way the year goes round and that's why i wanted to tell you so that you can get ready. In two or three days you can come up here and get the wood to build your booths. Meanwhile you must fix up your paraphernalia, your whistles, and anything else you will need. I don't want to take up too much time talking this evening, as we have a great deal to do.

The first night of singing was a rehearsal, but people from the village came around to hear the songs. Some doctors would refuse to sing because of the villagers' presence. After the first round of singing, the spectators were told to leave because the doctors now had to make smoke offerings to the animals and this was not open to people outside of the Doctor Lodge.¹⁰

Seating at this and other events was very strictly designated. Divided between north and south, doctors representing animal lodges that coincided with the cardinal and semi-cardinal directions were seated around the lodge, with the exception of the east position, which was where the door was located, representing the birthplace of the day's light and of emergence from the womb. Songs were traded back and forth between the north and south doctors after the smoke offering beginning with the north-east and south-east positions near the door. Upon reaching the halfway point in the song-swapping buffalo meat that had been boiling in a pot in the centre of the lodge was distributed. This was all highly formalized, with meat portions of specific sizes given to different doctor-singers, with one portion being sent to the wife of the doctor whose lodge was being usurped for the performance.¹¹

Three days later, the doctors returned to the lodge to build their booths. They came in very early wearing only their loin cloths and moccasins. They sang four songs of four rounds for each song (each doctor singing). Pipe Offering then told them where to find the cottonwood saplings to build their booths and they went out to that location. Two cottonwoods were to be taken and used in the ceremony standing to the west of the lodge. These two trees were taken with great ceremony, one of the doctors offering smoke to the lower, middle and

upper portion of the tree from each direction, with the offering being repeated with the ashes from the pipe when the tobacco was gone. This done, the trees were then cut with an equal amount of formality, with cuts being made at the cardinal points and the trees being felled to the east, where men were waiting to let it down easily so as not to break the branches. Chips from the cutting were gathered up and thrown into the creek or carried home and burned in the fireplace. On their way back to the lodge, the doctors participated in one of the more curious aspects of this sequence of events. They engaged in a contest of hypnotism – *patsaku* – meaning to ‘shoot’ one another, being the word used to for this. Weltfish described this event as told to her by her informant:

They made peculiar motions with their eagle-wing fans, touching the ground. Then some were knocked down and got up growling and grunting. One of them ‘hypnotized’ another by trying to put a corn cob in his throat, making his mouth all bloody. Another attempted to put fish bones in someone’s throat, with the same result. The victims vomited up these things without too much damage being done and continued to move along with the cottonwoods.¹²

The cottonwoods were placed in the ground to the west of the lodge, and a cedar tree was also ritually collected, in much the same manner as the cottonwoods, and placed in the lodge. It was brought in trunk end first, and a carried it clockwise around the lodge with the trunk end pointing toward the fireplace, stopping when the top was pointing to the east again. By this time, the other doctors had constructed their booths within the lodge and they watched the proceedings from there. The pipe smoke and ash ceremony described above was repeated, and food that had been donated to the doctors for the occasion was eaten, with all food being shared with the other-than-human powers that were present for the ceremony. These would include Mother Corn, Father Buffalo and the other animal lodge forces that imbued the whole.¹³

After all this ritual preparation that was a series of performances unto itself, the Big Doctor ‘Opera’ began. This performance, or collection of performances, was traditionally spread out over a twenty-day period. To briefly summarize these performances, it is easiest to state the kinds of performances, and then describe the frequency with which they occurred during twenty-day period. There were three basic kinds of performances in the ‘Doctors’ Grand Opera’. First (Performance type ‘A’) were the slight-of-hand tricks that were known to befuddle even colonial observers, but were generally viewed as entertaining. Examples of this include the apparent swallowing of a deer head with antlers on, the shooting of a young boy with arrows without harming him, or the disembowelling of an individual by a bear. The latter of these was known to have stymied the US Army Major Frank North when he was a clerk on the Pawnee reservation. At another

performance in Oklahoma after the Pawnee were forced out of Nebraska, George Bird Grinnell of Yale witnessed performances that he was unable to explain.¹⁴

A second performance type (B) was what Weltfish called the 'Big Dance'. In this ceremony many of the doctors dressed as their respective animal lodge helpers and performed comical skits outside of the Doctor Lodge. Some of the doctors would remain in human form and antagonize the other animals from within the lodge. This was accompanied by eagle bone whistles and sometimes quite dramatic action. For example, Weltfish's informant recounted an incident where the 'bears' caught a 'horse' and laid him on his back, exposing the human underneath the costume. One of the 'bears' then laid open the stomach of the 'horse' and took a piece of liver, then the other took a piece. The people who were watching cried that he would never get enough to eat now because with his liver gone, his stomach would grow so large it could never be filled. Then both 'bears' jumped on the 'horse' and healed his wounds, using medicine that they carried in their mouths which they rubbed on the victims stomach. They shook him back to a conscious state, where he apparently did not know what had happened. But the people knew that he would never again get enough to eat.¹⁵

The third kind of performance (C) in the Grand Doctor Opera was the 'Dance of the Scalped Ones' (*Kitsaburuksu*). The unsettled spirits of those who had been scalped were featured in this Pawnee version of a carnival 'House of Horrors'. It was much like the Big Dance of the animals, with many participants who covered themselves with mud and used other means to 'develop a general mood of wierdness'.¹⁶ There were drummers and singing that accompanied the performance; the songs were also 'wierd' or 'spooky' and when they had ended, the actors ran in and back out of the Doctors' Lodge four times. The last time they ran backwards with particular movements and fell down, seemingly dazed, and would then 'come to' and run back into the lodge.¹⁷

The three performances were organized over a period of twenty days (formerly it had been thirty days) into a pattern outlined by Weltfish using the 'A, B and C' symbols. There were four cycles of four performances with an introduction and a conclusion:

A. Introductory performance indoors, to open the proceedings.

First cycle

B. Outdoor Big Dance the following day in the late afternoon.

A. Indoor performance the next night

Interval of one day.

A. Indoor performance the next night.

Interval of one day.

Second Cycle

B. Outdoor Big Dance, late afternoon

C. Dance of the Scalped Ones, outdoors.

A. Indoor performance the next night.

Interval of one day.

C. Dance of the Scalped Ones, outdoors.

Third Cycle

B. Outdoor Big Dance

Interval of one day.

A. Indoor performance next night.

Interval of one day.

A. Indoor performance next night.

Fourth Cycle

B. Outdoor Big Dance, fourth and final one

A. Indoor performance at night, to close. Grand Finale with the Buffalo
Clown warriors attacking the Bears and conquering them.¹⁸

This seems to have been essentially an indigenous circus. It is hard to know the meaning of this performance without having lived in the cultural context of the Pawnee of that period. But one thing is certain: the animals of the plains peoples' world were an intimate part of their performances, as they were an intimate part of their daily lives. These animals also provided sustenance, meaning that the animals that had to be routinely killed in order for the people to survive were given a voice and their life-energy was acknowledged as a gift and a necessity to the Indians. An equivalent in Euro-American society might be if people were to give voice to the steers, hogs, chickens or other animals that were routinely consumed. While there were animals used in these colonial performances, they were always secondary to a theme of conquest in a military play, or they were completely controlled by their human masters in circus performances. In the indigenous world, animals were given a voice and agency, and they wielded power that was experienced both in the physical realm and in the unseen realm of visions and dreams. The Pawnee lived their myths in the ritual performances built into their seasonal rounds. The imported colonial society had performance 'seasons' as well, and their mythic world was presented in their performances.

West of the Mississippi River during the Antebellum period, another generation of the culture of empire discussed in earlier chapters followed potential customers up the Missouri River Valley and onto the savannah prairies of the new state of Missouri. Menageries, circuses, minstrel shows, 'legitimate' theatre and other 'entertainments' made their way up the river, primarily by steamboat, to St Joseph before the Civil War. The imperial character of these performances was on display in the performances of such companies as the 'Great Philadelphia Zoological Garden' which came to Missouri in 1845. According to the playbills, this show featured a twenty-one car wagon train with an elephant pulling the band-car and an animal trainer that would 'harness and drive a Nubian lion'. This circus reportedly played at most of the river towns, including those as far upstream as Richmond, Liberty, Platte City, Westport and Independence. The

latter of these were recently constructed towns just across the river from Indian Territory.¹⁹

Isaac A. Van Amburgh was one of the most noted animal 'trainers' of his day, and he came to Missouri in the 1850s. Known as the 'Lion King', Van Amburgh dressed as a Roman gladiator and quoted the Bible's claim that God had created Man superior to animals.²⁰ He would demonstrate this alleged superiority by 'forcing' these animals to kneel at his feet and lick his hands, a 'morally instructive' lesson designed to win over members of his Christian audiences who considered the circus immoral. He apparently had a reputation for threatening and actually beating his animals with a crow bar. His performances often featured his own blood; he dared lions to bite his bloodied arm off while it was in their mouths. In terms of the performance's meaning to Van Amburgh's frontier audiences, it provided rationale for the attitude of superiority commonplace among people who commonly killed the abundant wildlife simply for the sake of killing.²¹

In 1856, Den Stone's Circus combined with Mabie's menagerie of Wisconsin and Tyler's Indian Exhibition to bring an early version of a Wild West show to Missouri. A playbill appeared the *Weekly Missouri Statesman* of Columbia with an ad that read:

Foremost among the attractive novelties of this
Company are the characteristic performances of the
WILD TENANTS OF THE FOREST
Costumed and decorative in the habiliments, illustrating scenes of savage
life.
THE BUFFALO HUNT!
In which the whole party will appear in animated scene of action.
And again, in an amusing Pastoral Scene, called
THE CORN GATHERING.
Interspersed with Grotesque Dancing, Singing, Whooping, &c. –
besides the following:
The Bird Dance!
THANKSGIVING DANCE!
War Song of the Seneca, &c.
Also the Tableaux by the Indians:
Pocahontas rescuing Capt. Smith!
SCALPING GROUP!
The War Song, &c. &c.²²

The company depicted aspects of indigenous culture that dealt with the obtaining of food, but there was no serious effort made to understand that culture. The tenor of the performance seems to have been reminiscent of Forrest's *Metamora*, where the 'Noble Savage' fades into oblivion and symbolically transfers his 'nobility' to the conquerors. The company reportedly used 'real Indians' in the performance, although we know little of what they actually did. Unlike

Sol Smith's use of Muskogee Indians in Columbus, when they 'took over' the performance of *Pizarro*, these Indians seem to have acquired jobs portraying themselves as imagined by whites. Their billing as the 'Wild Tenants of the Forest' and particularly the representation of scalping can be seen as a highly developed version of John Durang's performances in Montreal and Quebec City in 1797. Unlike Durang, those depicting the 'Grotesque Singing and Whooping' may have been Indian actors glad to get a job after losing their land and the culture that grew from it. Combined with a collection of animals under the strict control of white animal 'trainers', these performances were in demand among the burgeoning white population west of the Mississippi.

There is an interesting twist to Mabie's tour of Missouri in 1856 that underscores the growing rift in the Euro-American Empire. The struggle over the expansion of slavery in the 1850s was coming to a head in nearby Kansas Territory. Recently created by the Kansas-Nebraska Act that opened up the so-called 'Indian Territory' to white settlement, those who relocated to the territory (or squatters who were already there) would vote to decide the issue of whether or not the institution of slavery would expand into the Great Plains. Missourians, many of whom crossed the Missouri River to vote illegally, typically came down on the pro-slavery side. 'Free-soilers' – those who opposed slavery's expansion – coming to the territory often from as far away as New England and even England itself, had set themselves up in the newly founded town of Lawrence. Determined to limit the immigration of northern free-soilers into the region, pro-slavery Missourians tried to 'screen' the immigrants by blocking them, unsuccessfully, from entering the territory. Confrontations and even a few pitched battles were commonplace. So it was a detriment to Mabie's future in Missouri when the newspaper in Brunswick, in the centre of the state, reprinted articles from the border towns of Weston and Parkville announcing that the company's elephant trainer was an abolitionist. According to these reports, the trainer had tried to help a slave escape from a Missouri plantation; an attempt that 'would have succeeded but for the energy of the Negro's owner'.²³ Derogatory remarks on the 'menagerie' itself were included; as well as a warning to 'Look to your interests, friends!'²⁴ The split in the empire over the expansion of slavery did not spare popular culture.

There is another aspect of Mabie's circus that is worth noting. As noted in Chapter Four, it was commonplace among these itinerant companies to combine menageries, animal trainers, equestrian performers, drama and, increasingly in the nineteenth century, blackface minstrel shows. Indeed, it is a vein of circus folklore that Ed and Jerry Mabie were among the first to include it as an 'after-piece' of the circus, often charging an extra fee to stay for the performance. The combination of the company's reputation in Missouri as an 'abolitionist concern' along with its presentation of blackface minstrel shows as part of its entertainment indicates

not only the popularity of minstrelsy, but that negative stereotypes of African Americans were just as common in northern performances as southern. Even in the 'black Republican' town of Lawrence, a place that was destroyed by pro-slave Missourians twice and rebuilt both times, it was apparently not uncommon to find a 'Nigger Show' at the local Mason's Lodge by 1859.²⁵ The racial aspect of this point has been made elsewhere, but that it was a fundamental aspect of this expanding empire is a fact that still needs to be internalized realizing the depth of the imperial culture's impact on the human psyche.

The first recorded performances of the 'empire republic' on the Great Plains west of the Missouri River were military band concerts held at Fort Leavenworth in 'Indian Territory'.²⁶ Like Fort Pitt in the eighteenth century, this fort headquartered an army that served the expansionist interests of the empire's policymakers in Washington, D.C. It had been established in 1827 to supply and quarter troops who were protecting Euro-American commercial interests in the central plains. The fur trapping industry and international trade with Mexico had their nexus there. Trappers and traders travelling up and down the Missouri River as well as those venturing over the Santa Fe Trail sought and received protection from troops at Fort Leavenworth.²⁷

The first commercial newspaper accounts of one of these concerts describes a performance for the residents of the nascent town of Leavenworth at the Kansas House hotel in May 1855 by the military band of Company E, US Dragoons, Sgt Johnson conducting.²⁸ The first civilian performance in Kansas Territory appears to have been a show for a mix of lower class Euro-Americans and Irish immigrants, many of whom were soldiers stationed at the Fort. A travelling blackface minstrel show called Well's Minstrels presented their show of low comedy, skits and songs on St Patrick's Day, 17 March 1856. This show would not have had the edge of the unruly and satirical humour of Tom Rice's 'Jim Crow' shows of the 1830s; nevertheless the troupe did express a sort of rebellion by absconding without paying for their playbills, an act that was nearly a cliché for an itinerant theatre troupe.²⁹

On Monday, 28 July 1856, 'Washburn's Great American Colossal Circus' came to the brand new town of Leavenworth advertizing two shows with three clowns, string and brass bands and featuring 'Shi-na-poh-mah, or the Winged Bird – the only aboriginal equestrian of the Arena in the world'. The show also included Sac and Fox Indians, probably drawn from the nearby reserve.³⁰ These were quite possibly the same Indians who performed in the Mabie show.

This was just a few months before the Iowa, Delaware, the Confederate Peoria, Kaskaskia, Wea and Piankeshaw trust lands, originally given to them in perpetuity and now part of Kansas Territory, were to go on sale, the Delawares' scheduled for 20 October 1856.³¹ The lands were 'given' to these Indian refugees, who were already some 1,000 miles from their traditional homelands in the Old

North-West, Mid-Atlantic and New England regions. The lands had been negotiated away from the native Kansa, Osage, Otoe, Missouri and Pawnee peoples who had lived in the region in some cases for several centuries.³²

If individuals as diverse as Secretary of War John C. Calhoun and missionary Isaac McCoy are taken at their word, there were some influential persons who advocated for an Indian Territory in the Trans-Missouri West; a place where indigenous peoples could be removed from the corrupting affects of white culture. Indian history scholar William Unrau has devoted a book to the question of how seriously the 'permanence' of this Indian Territory was taken at the time.³³ His well-supported conclusion is: not very. The manipulation of the native peoples' circumstances for the purpose of profiting from their land was well-rehearsed by the 1850s, and the culture that rationalized the occupation and usurpation of that land was making inroads into the Great Plains by this decade.

Two maps drawn thirty-seven years apart reveal much about the evolving views of 'Indian Territory'. René Paul, a fur trader who had worked for the Chouteau family, one of the dominant traders in the mid-Missouri Valley, drew a map in 1816 based on the notes of his father-in-law, Auguste Chouteau, a St Louis 'city father'. According to this map, nearly all the lands west of the Mississippi to the High Plains region (roughly two-thirds of the way across modern-day Kansas and Nebraska), and north of the Arkansas River were owned by about ten Indian groups. These included the Pawnee, Kansa, Osage, Ponca, Omaha and a few others. The other map was drawn at the behest of Abelard Guthrie, a mixed-blood Shawnee-Wyandot with an eye on the main chance – a type known as an 'Uncle Tomahawk'. This map did not show the legal boundaries of communally owned reserves at all, but rather showed only the total area assigned to all Indian groups. Indeed, in the eyes of expansionists like Missouri Congressman Thomas Hart Benton or profiteers like Guthrie, this map – by design – made it very easy to overlook the fact that these reserves were meant to include adequate rangeland for both bison and later cattle. They publicized it for the purpose of depicting vast tracts of empty land to be speculated and squatted upon by Euro-Americans, including and especially themselves and their friends.³⁴

Leavenworth rapidly expanded with pro-slave Missouri immigrants during the height of the 'Bleeding Kansas' conflict. In November 1856, 'Monsieur Gabay' and his 'Dramatic Troupe' came into town from Weston, Missouri with their 'farces, drama, [and] impersonations of human nature'.³⁵ Gabay had accompanied the George F. Browne 'Model Dramatic Troupe' to the Missouri Valley that summer. Browne's repertoire was the standard stock plays popular in the East, which he billed as 'chaste' entertainments to minimize objections from critics of the theatre in the West.³⁶ Gabay's offshoot company played for crowded houses in Leavenworth that autumn. He expressed a desire to remain in town for some time, but lamented the lack of adequate facilities.³⁷ An upstairs room in

the downtown area was refurbished and dubbed the 'Leavenworth Theatre', subsequently proclaimed by the local press to be an 'elegant establishment' for the company and their Kansas amateur 'supers'.³⁸

The following summer, as confrontations between pro-slavery and free-state forces continued, circuses and theatre troupes were commonplace in this part of the Missouri River valley. 'Sands, Nathan and Company', a 'French American Circus', as well as the New England Bards and the Thayer family were providing public entertainment ranging from the plebeian circus to the bourgeois concert hall, such as it was.³⁹ That autumn, a theatre space dubbed 'Melodeon Hall', on the third floor of a building on Cherokee Street between Main and Second, was constructed at a cost just over \$15,000. This 300 seat performance space was available to rent at twenty-five dollars a night.⁴⁰

Euro-American performances in the mid- and lower Missouri Valley followed the same pattern of Ohio and Mississippi Valley theatres. Performances ranging from circus acts to 'legitimate' stock plays were standard fare. The main difference between Leavenworth theatre and theatres further east was its role as the gateway town to 'Bleeding Kansas'. The struggle between the two opposing forces of empire for the expansion of the plantation complex of slavery overlaid the usurpation of the land from the indigenous peoples of the central plains.⁴¹

Theatre performers, by and large, were of the itinerant variety, although locals did fill in the gaps to a great extent – especially at a frontier locale like Leavenworth in the 1850s. Performers from the East were hesitant to travel all the way up the Missouri River to Leavenworth. The western circuit, as it had existed since the Kentucky Circuit days, typically turned south at St Louis and the majority of players did not venture further west until after the Civil War. But some did, and according to the reports of Leavenworth newspapers, they were usually welcomed with good attendance at their performances. However, one account highly critical of entertainment in Leavenworth, characterized the majority of the players who performed locally as 'merciless mountebanks' who 'mouth a sentence as a cur mouths a bone'. Leavenworth residents, the critic continued, would rather pay to see 'Negro witticisms' and good music than bad drama.⁴² This account reflects the growing disillusionment with mixed theatre that had been a complaint of bourgeois crowds for some time and a rising desire for venues that presented exclusively highbrow entertainment.⁴³ Class divisions in the empire republic were less obvious than racial exclusion and repression, but were just as present.

Bourgeois culture was in short supply on the leading edge of empire in Leavenworth. 'Legitimate' entertainment divorced from the 'lower' varieties had been a goal of the upper segments of society on both sides of the Atlantic for much of the century at that point. So when George Burt and his wife Agnes arrived in Leavenworth from St Joseph, Missouri in the spring of 1858 as expe-

rienced and respected Thespians, hopes were raised among those desiring such reforms. The Burts, according to one local newspaper, had come to Leavenworth as harbingers of 'respectable' society with reputations among the 'highest theatrical circles in the Union'. Mrs Burt was purportedly in 'the best social circles' of St Joseph. George Burt had designed Smith's Theatre in St Joseph, so had considerable experience in theatrical matters compared to the other residents of Leavenworth, Kansas Territory.⁴⁴

The tension between pro- and anti-slave people on the Kansas frontier is hard to over-state. A song that was performed at Smith's Theatre in St Joseph around this time, titled 'The Kansas War and Other Matters', reveals some of this tension:

I believe the border ruffians are filling up your towns,
 I believe the Doniphan Tigers are a husky pack of hounds,
 I believe the only difference – Abolitionists and Free Soilers;
 Is the one will steal your niggers, and other will steal your dollars
 But oh the woe these chaps will feel,
 When the devil gets them down, they'll squirm like an eel.
 I believe that Northern folks believe all the Southern people
 Work Niggers in a yoke with a ring and a steeple;
 They thing it ar'nt right for one man to work another,
 While their sisters pail the *Ceows* – they make Cooks of their Mother,
 But oh the woe the grief they feel
 For everything that's black with tar on the heel.
 ...
 I believe in good plain dress – in clothes as well as speaking,
 And if I must confess – I look for some trick sneaking,
 When I see folks put on airs in religion or politeness,
 To hide a cloven foot neath smirks of polish'd brightness,
 For oh St. Jo., you all ought to know,
 The things I have sung about are just exactly so.⁴⁵

This kind of double-edged commentary was typical of minstrel shows, although the context in which this song was performed is unclear.

In honour of the Burt's arrival in Leavenworth, a new theatre had been fixed up by H. T. Clark and Company at the corner of 3rd and Delaware Streets. 'Fitted up in real city style', there was a stage with scenery, with an elevated floor sloping toward the back of the hall and seating for five hundred souls. Burt's Union Theatre, as it was eventually known, soon became the primary venue for 'legitimate' theatre in Kansas Territory. The newly remodelled theatre opened on Tuesday night, 23 March 1858 with *The Drunkard*, followed by other entertainment where the Burts 'sustained their high reputation.'⁴⁶

In this theatre that catered to the local merchant class, plays representing moral reform brought in receipts with regularity. *The Drunkard*, written by W.

H. Smith and debuted in New York in 1844, was one of the most popular of the 'reform' plays that appeared with increasing frequency in the middle years of the century. This play – for that matter, this subgenre – represented a recycling of a similar vein of performance in the colonial period epitomized by plays like *George Barnwell*. Where *Barnwell* had represented combination of a folksong with the market economic goal of productivity and loyalty in apprenticeship, *The Drunkard* utilized the melodramatic formula that combined folktale with the bourgeois goal of worker productivity. There is a fall from idyllic nature to hopeless despair caused by human frailty and the dastardliness of the villain, followed by heroic and miraculous restoration to virtue and harmony through personal determination and divine intervention. In this case the protagonist, Edward Middleton, virtuously wins the heart of fair Mary in spite of the machinations of the villainous lawyer, Greer. Edward and Mary are married. They have a daughter, Julia, and Edward soon begins drinking. Greer preys on Edward's weakness for the cup, and the hero begins the downward spiral of alcoholism. Edward moves to New York, where his despair reaches new depths culminating in a dramatic *delirium tremens* scene reminiscent of Pizarro's vision of hell. A wealthy benefactor then takes Edward into his care, where he miraculously recovers his sanity. Greer is sent off to prison for forgery. Mary, Edward and Julia are reunited in the final tableau, where Edward sits at the table, one hand on the Bible, one pointed to the sky, as Mary and Julia lovingly look on. The pathos of alcoholism is captured in the play, as is the plight of the innocent victims.⁴⁷

Reform movements in America that grew out of the 'Second Great Awakening' and events such as the Seneca Falls conference of 1848 had spread to frontier communities mainly through the efforts of women. A plan for reforming 'drunkards' was one of the chief goals of reformers and a group known as the 'Washingtonians', a kind of nineteenth-century Alcoholics Anonymous. The need for such a plan, as many saw it, was dire. Leavenworth's first directory, published in 1857, lists twenty saloons for a town that could not have contained much more than 2,000 souls, though it was growing rapidly. Those wishing to establish profitable and respectable businesses, like a newspaper publisher, would want to see plays such as *The Drunkard* performed in the town. The business owning classes supported the temperance movement, and stories like the one depicted in *The Drunkard* were seen as models for productive workers. Edward inherited his money in the play, but the mythos of economic empire that included 'pulling oneself up by the bootstraps' was at the heart of plays like *The Drunkard*. The important distinction here is that not all workers would actually achieve the promises set forward in this myth. But the *prospect* of that financial success was the driving force behind the expansion of the American empire. To limit the growth of the empire republic was seen as limiting opportunity to achieve the 'American dream', and the alcoholic citizen-worker undermined this

myth. The image of the productive worker, struck down by alcoholism but saved by the intervention of God, friends and family sent the message to working class society that alcoholism could be overcome, and that productive virtue would reign supreme.⁴⁸

The initial success of the Burts's theatre led to further improvements. In April 1858, a new drop curtain of red, white and blue bunting was installed, as well as a marble pavement stone at the foot of the stage that simply read 'Union.'⁴⁹ Kansas Territory was on the national stage as an experiment in popular sovereignty for determining its slave or free status as outlined in the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854. While the sentiment in Leavenworth was predominately pro-Union, it was also predominately pro-slavery. The early population of the town took the border state view which embraced slavery while eschewing secession. Indeed, the *Kansas Weekly Herald* reported in February of 1858 that the Kansas territorial legislature was considering a bill that would free all 'Negroes' within its boundaries. This 'Nigger Bill', as the editor termed it, would trample underfoot the Constitution (the three-fifths clause) and the Supreme Court (*Dred Scott v. Sandford* [1857]). 'Do not', this editor implored, defy constitutional law and justice and 'set all the Negroes free among us.'⁵⁰ The majority of newspapers in town were pro-slavery although it might be more appropriate to characterize their (mythic) views by quoting the *Weekly Journal's* motto: 'Kansas, State Rights, The Union, and the Rights of the People.'⁵¹ After its founding in 1858, the *Leavenworth Daily Times* was the primary anti-slavery or 'free-soil' paper in town that frequently railed against Missouri 'ruffians' and the rampant voter fraud that characterized 'Bleeding' Kansas. The issue of slavery was a dissonance that theatre was called upon to attenuate, but such a responsibility was beyond theatre's capacity.

In Leavenworth, theatrical performance began to occur with some consistency at the makeshift 'Melodeon Hall', on Cherokee Street, in the spring of 1858. Mr and Mrs D. L. Scott, who had performed in the Missouri valley and in eastern theatres, began singing to 'large crowds' in April and by May were featuring some of the standard melodramas of the day. Advertizing the venue as 'Scott's Theatre', the Scotts hired professional players such as Emily Mestayer and C. R. Thorne, both from theatrical families that had toured with the now defunct Smith and Ludlow troupe based in St Louis. These performers could be found as readily at the Melodeon as at the Union, although the Union received the lion's share of press reviews. Indeed, the hiring of 'stars' who were touring in the West was becoming commonplace as the 'star system' began to replace the old stock company as the standard theatre business model.⁵² Local talents were as scarce as they were dubious and in any case, the public seemed to appreciate fresh and skilled players on the stage. Like theatre managers in the United States from William Dunlap forward, filling the seats with a paying audience was the

final word in a theatre's success. The drawing power of the stars that frontier audiences had either seen back east or read about in the newspapers trumped the stock company.

Undoubtedly for these very reasons, the Burts were not above 'Ethiopian delineation.' The blackface farce of *Toodles* was performed on 25 March 1858 at the Union Theatre.⁵³ In May 1858, a touring blackface minstrel show calling itself 'Durant's New England Bards' appeared at the Union Theatre in Leavenworth. An advertisement for this troupe appeared with the curious motto: 'Unfurl the standard to the breeze, raise the glorious ensign high. Shout aloud for victory, onward is our Battle Cry.'⁵⁴ A minstrel show billing itself as from New England, the birthplace of white-supported abolitionism, further underscores the universal popularity of the minstrel show in the United States.

A fire destroyed much of Leavenworth's downtown area on 15 July 1858. It apparently began around midnight in the second floor dressing room of the Union Theatre, leaving only Melodeon Hall as the lone theatre space in town. A south-west wind reportedly sent the fire down Delaware Street until it was finally doused by a bucket brigade aided by a thunderstorm at 2 a.m.⁵⁵ In the aftermath of the conflagration, business owners in the town and the Burts supported efforts to build a new theatre on Shawnee Street, which they hoped to complete by mid-September.⁵⁶ It turned out to be November before the new National Theatre opened at Fourth and Delaware Streets. 'Joe Berch's Minstrels' were advertised at what was (falsely) claimed to be the only theatre west of St Louis.⁵⁷ The National Theatre debut of manager George Burt followed with *The Stranger*, *Lady of Lyons*, and *The Drunkard*.⁵⁸ Also after the fire, D.L. Scott began presenting shows in a room at Third and Delaware that became known as Stockton Hall. Both the future President, Abraham Lincoln (1859), and his assassin, John Wilkes Booth (1863), would appear on this stage.⁵⁹

In the spring of 1859, Stockton Hall presented 'Campbell's Minstrels', another travelling minstrel show, this one featured a brass band. The popularity of the Campbell's Minstrels name during the 1850s had led to multiple shows using that name; the one in Leavenworth advertised itself as 'Beler's Campbell Minstrels'. With 'Pell as 'Brudder Bones', the review reads, they 'surpass anything of the kind that has ever been seen in our city', their jokes having a 'spice of originality' compared to the 'hackneyed saws' to which Leavenworthers were accustomed – comments designed to fill the seats.⁶⁰ Over at the National Theatre, the Burt contingent continued with mostly stock plays, with the 'stars' Emily and Louis J. Mestayer as featured performers, although they played Stockton Hall with the Thornes as well. To underscore the increasing presence of 'free-staters' and the declining influence of 'pro-slave' interests in Leavenworth, the editor of the *Leavenworth Daily Times* observed that thunderstorms were moving toward Weston [Missouri] whose atmosphere, 'Heaven knows, needs purging'.⁶¹

Horace Greeley, the New York newspaper man who advocated the continental expansion of Euro-American society, followed his own admonition to 'Go West' and arrived in Leavenworth on 17 May 1859. The newspapers of this period have numerous advertizements directed at 'fifty-niners' bound for the 'gold fields of Kansas' on the Front Range of the Rocky Mountains. A benefit performance for Mrs Kate Demin and Sam Ryan, part of the popular Ryan family of troupers, featured *A Life of a Woman in the Mines, or, Adventures at Pike's Peak*.⁶² The quest for gold had been as the motive of imperial expansion from Hernan Cortes's conquest of Mexico to the Virginia Company's Jamestown project; the Kansas gold rush was another wave of that quest. California veterans who had 'seen the elephant' and greenhorns from back East descended on the elbow of the Missouri River to outfit themselves for the trek across the plains. This quest would exacerbate relations with the Plains Indians, making the military installation of Fort Leavenworth a self-fulfilling prophecy and ushering in seemingly the last generation free and independent indigenous peoples on the Great Plains.⁶³

It is difficult to find a more clear-cut example of cognitive dissonance within the empire than the pro- and anti-slavery theatrical adaptations of Harriet Beecher Stowe's novel *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. The anti-slavery version was presented in the melodramatic style with the Manichean characters of good and evil. The pro-slavery version tended to take on the manic air of a minstrel show. By the time regular theatre performances were presented in Leavenworth, both black-face minstrelsy and Stowe's novel had taken the country by storm. In places where pro-slave sentiment was dominant, such as the burgeoning town of Leavenworth in its early years, this dissonance was particularly acute. The first presentation of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* here brought in 'by all odds the largest audience of the season'⁶⁴ in October of 1859. This version of the play was most likely that of George Aiken's which maintained the anti-slavery tenor of the story. At this performance, slavery supporter William Yerby took exception to that sentiment and protested so vociferously that the police were called to remove him from the theatre. Yerby was fined for disturbing the theatre's peace but he nevertheless challenged Leavenworth's Marshall Malone to a 'duel with Colt revolvers, large size, at sixteen paces'. He also reportedly threatened the press to which the editor of the *Leavenworth Daily Times* replied, 'Oh, dear how we quake in our stocking-feet.'⁶⁵ This was a typical exchange between the two sides at this point.

In August of 1862 *Uncle Tom's Cabin* was presented again, but this time Leavenworth residents saw a version which downplayed the anti-slavery sentiment of the original novel. The editor of the anti-slavery *Leavenworth Daily Conservative* noted critically that Simon Legree was left out, and Uncle Tom was portrayed as the obedient 'happy ducky'.⁶⁶ Both Christy's and Wood's minstrels had a pro-slave *Uncle Tom's Cabin* as early as 1853. A one act skit called

Life among the Happy was developed into an 'anti-Uncle Tom opera' by omitting August St Clare and Simon Legree, two of the slave owning antagonists. A version of the play by Henry J. Conroy eliminated the anti-slavery theme, adding a comical character 'Mr. Penetrate Partyside'. By the time of these performances in Leavenworth, there were at least three different 'anti-Tom' plays onstage in New Orleans.⁶⁷

The *Times* editor briefly described a version presented the next year:

'Uncle Tom's Cabin' is announced at the theatre for this and to-morrow evenings. A crowded house greeted its first production, Wednesday night, and we can unhesitatingly say that as far as it goes the play was excellently put upon the stage and in the leading characters well done ... but nevertheless the omission of the scenes with Legree and Casey, and the death of Uncle Tom, make the play seem as incomplete as if one had read only the first volume of the book itself, with no chance of getting the remainder of the story. Lack of people may be sufficient excuse for shortening the play, and we would much rather this were the case than that it were done to spare the sensibilities of the resident remnant of Border Ruffianism in the city.⁶⁸

That theatre managers continued to present the watered down version of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* attests to the lingering persistence of pro-slave sentiment in Leavenworth. And even the sympathetic Aiken version eliminated debates over slavery as well as much of the context that Stowe provided in the novel to give the humanity of the enslaved maximum impact on the reader.⁶⁹

The southern secession and the beginning of armed civil conflict – another civil war in the English-speaking empire of North America – was reflected at the Empire's western edge. 'Jayhawkers on the Stage' was a featured performance at the old National, now renamed the 'American Theatre' by 'Colonel' Ben Wheeler, who had been performing at the Melodeon since 1860. Now, military 'bombast' joined minstrelsy, the circus, and 'legitimate' theatre on Leavenworth stages. An unadvertized performance of *Bombastes Furioso* reportedly 'brought down the house' in September of 1861. The involvement of the audience in these types of performances is seen in an incident reported in the *Daily Conservative*. At the end of the performance, while General Bombastes and the King lay dead on the stage, an individual from the audience appeared from behind the scenes and tore an epaulet from the General's coat. He then took a pair of the General's boots that were hanging from a hook on the wall under a sign that read: 'He who these boots displace – must meet Bombastes face to face'. The crowd roared, the boots and epaulet were returned, and veteran actor John Merrifield, who portrayed Bombastes, said he had seen nothing like it in twenty-four years.⁷⁰

These performances were a continuation of the empire republic's culture that had been emerging with its own expression separate from that of Britain. Juxtaposed against the indigenous performances of the Pawnee peoples during this same era, the difference between the meanings of the two are stark. The perform-

ances of the expanding empire were clearly descended from those of the British Empire. The minstrel shows and the 'red-face' performances became popular in Britain as well as in the US. While theatre had provided insulation against the raw edge of imperial conquest, the conflict over the expansion of slavery became more than even theatre could assuage. As happened in the 1770s regarding the Trans-Atlantic Empire, the Trans-Appalachian empire imploded over Constitutional issues engendered by a centralized power structure bent on expansion. All of this was coming to a head at the frontier town of Leavenworth, Kansas Territory in the 1850s. Blackface minstrelsy's popularity was near its peak, Indian wars on the plains were not going well although their lands in the new territory were being expropriated once again, and the struggle over slavery's expansion was in close proximity – so close that theatre performance could not work its magic.

Ritual theorists argue that one of the primary purposes of dramatic ritual performance in human history has been to minimize factionalism by bridging social contradictions.⁷¹ In a country conflicted to the degree that the US was in the 1850s – with the question of slavery at the forefront of political debate; a 'democratic' nation that denied citizenship to large numbers of its residents; a nation founded on 'freedom' yet largely dependent economically on the plantation system of slavery; a litigious nation championing the sanctity of private property and contract yet ignoring the property rights of native groups and breaking every treaty ever made with them – the ability for theatrical performance to assuage this cognitive dissonance was overwhelmed. Performances in the 1850s began to metamorphize into war, especially in that part of North America where the status quo was being challenged both internally and externally: the Great Plains.

CONCLUSION

Empire, as it has come to exist in the world today, is rooted in the capitalist system of economics. This system, and the detached philosophy and religious concepts upon which it is built, transform the earth from a *home* to a *resource base*. Indeed, religion has been colonized by this economic empire as have most other aspects of life in the modern world. The Great Plains poet John Neihardt once observed:

I think that many will grant that the religious sense, as now operating in the multitude has exchanged a spiritual for a material scale of values; that it is still truly the religious sense, however it may be disguised or denied; and that the fact of the transference dominates our time.¹

This describes a world view that has enabled a relatively small percentage of humans to become quite accustomed to and even expect unprecedented creature comforts, conveniences and material wealth. But this system is so focused on the *transaction* and the creation of more capital in that transaction that the deeper picture of the long-term consequences is obscured at best, but more often simply ignored. Indeed, the consequences are institutionally ignored, and performances have regularly aided and abetted the ignoring process. This is the legacy of the performances of empire that have helped create the modern world.

Indigenous performances, on the other hand, reveal a world view with a very different goal. Rather than ‘development’ and the accumulation of capital via the transaction, indigenous performances were *restorative*. Performances were designed to appease the forces that could conflict with human goals. These forces were not ‘supernatural’, but of great immediacy in the lives of indigenous North American villagers. This was only ‘mystical’ in the sense that many of these forces were ‘unseen’ and therefore potentially even more powerful than those visible in everyday life. They were not ‘imaginary’, but had a direct impact on people, whether providing food, shelter, clothing or acting to interrupt the process of acquiring provisions.

Empire, as defined at the outset of this study, was driven by the pursuit of individual and corporate gain. One can see this most glaringly in the colonial

expansionism that defined Britain and the US during this period. This study of performances as a spectrum ranging from the rituals of indigenous peoples to the 'entertainments' of colonial culture reveals more clearly the function of those performances within their cultural context.

Indigenous peoples, who contended with the earth most directly, incorporated other-than-human persons into their performances. Even if individuals were drawn to the acquisitive nature of the colonial paradigm, as long as the performances retained their intimacy with those plants and animals upon which the society depended, the communities remained quite resilient. This was shown to be the case most clearly among the Pawnee peoples of the central plains. In spite of the presence of three European empires, disease epidemics and raiding Lakota horsemen, they retained their culture and connections to their land base until they were simply so surrounded by white encroachment that they were forced to leave their homeland. Even then, as Gene Weltfish recorded in the 1920s and 1930s, this culture remained viable and adapted to the new situation of dependence upon the Empire. The prevalence of Iroquoian culture of the north-east was such that the French, British and Americans all adopted the performance of the Condolence Ceremony in order to maintain relations with eastern woodland peoples.

Treaties that were seemingly designed to assuage difficult relations between the various interests on the frontier turned out, when one regards the treaty performances in retrospect, to be institutionalized deceit; one of the hallmarks of Empire. At these treaty ceremonies were officials who, under the colour of British or American officialdom, were in fact pursuing their own interests, be they speculators, traders, investors or other interested parties. These officials, such as those representing the Ohio Company and other 'development' companies, represented a sort of 'shadow government', another hallmark of Empire. Performances in the colonial culture that portrayed the 'Glory, Commerce, and Liberty' of England or the 'Rising Glory of America' engendered the patriotic stirrings of the colonial rank-and-file. This patriotic sentiment was used to encourage the pursuit of wealth in the New World at the expense of indigenous Americans and enslaved Africans whose land and labour provided the bulk of the Empire's wealth; yet another hallmark of Empire.

As noted in the Introduction, performances create assumptions, and assumptions coalesce into mythologies that govern the behaviour of society's members. The performances in the British Empire or in the early empire republic functioned to control and channel public opinion toward the goals of the Empire, diverse and inconsistent as they may be at times. College performances of the colonial and revolutionary era revealed the presence of this phenomenon in the colonial and revolutionary periods. The transformation of captivity narratives into jeremiads for the imperial cause was on display in *The Armourer's Escape*,

starring the 'armourer' himself. The coincidental performances at Valley Forge and Major André's 'Meschianza', a paeon to General William Howe, traditionally seen as the two ends of the performance spectrum, take on a new similarity when viewed alongside the Green Corn Ceremony of eastern woodland peoples. The contrast is cannot simply be dismissed as a natural difference between two disparate cultures; it reveals the profound difference in the relationship these societies had with the resource base.

The performance of the indigenous relationship to the 'thunderbirds' of spring provided a striking contrast to the superficiality of 'Tammany' societies, as sincere as the latter may have been. The historical relationship between working and peasant class members of this economic empire and the indigenous peoples is not a happy one. From the Paxton Boys to the 'vigilantes' at Gnadenhütten, this relationship was all too often fraught with depredations and even massacres. For many, the conflation of the Native American and African 'Other' as seen in *Inkle and Yarico* represented a viewpoint of race that had greater influence than did the anti-slave trade message of the play. The bourgeois view of class structure and its projection into indigenous society was represented in this performance.

This class structure of the Empire was seen quite clearly in the performances by Ricketts's Circus and Bernard's theatre troupe in their respective tours of Canada. The presence of Empire in the plebeian performances of the circus was an important part of the expansion process. The curiosities of the Empire were displayed in menageries; audiences saw the martial skills of horsemen; performers re-enacted frontier Indian barbarities that rationalized displacement and destruction of Indian peoples and the 'victory' of the superior European Man over Beast was performed by animal 'trainers'. The 'legitimate' theatre had to await the presence of a significant officer corps, a governmental presence or the establishment of a bourgeoisie in the towns of the frontier. Theatre manager and London ex-patriot John Bernard was unwilling to suffer the inconveniences of Canada or the West, although he was quite at home among the southern Planter class.

The rise of Euro-American society in the Trans-Appalachian West ultimately gave birth to another kind of imperial performance. Combining elements of the circus and the legitimate theatre as well as folk culture via the melodrama, Sol Smith and Noah Ludlow provided a sort of incubator for these performances. Blackface comedy, song-and-dance, and ultimately the minstrel show came forth from this incubator. The uniquely American culture sought by the likes of William Dunlap and Philip Freneau proved to be, like the Empire itself, more than anyone could control. From 'Jim Crow' Rice to 'Campbell's Minstrels', popular culture both expressed and veiled the contradictions of the empire republic. These contradictions created a powder keg that ultimately exploded beginning on the central plains of North America and eventually becoming a bloody Civil War far worse than the one that had split the colonies from the Mother Country.

In its utilization of the tools of reason and the scientific method, 'western' society has created a built environment unprecedented in scope and in its capacity to exert powerful long-term influence on nearly every part of the earth. In doing so, it has placed itself on a pedestal that seemingly rises above the natural world. But the natural world is a big place, and the consequences of imperial hubris are catching up with us. As the poet Rolf Jacobsen wrote:

Sssh the sea says
Sssh the small waves at the shore say, sssh Not so violent, not
So haughty, not
So remarkable. Sssh
Say the tips of the waves
Crowding around the headland's Surf. Sssh.
They say to people
This is our earth,
Our eternity.²

An indigenous world view is one that includes humanity on an equal footing with these other-than-human forces.

NOTES

The following abbreviations are used throughout the notes:

<i>KWH</i>	<i>Kansas Weekly Herald.</i>
<i>LDT</i>	<i>Leavenworth Daily Times.</i>
<i>WJP</i>	<i>The Papers of Sir William Johnson</i> , ed. A. C. Flick, 14 vols (Albany, NY: State University of New York, 1921–64).

Introduction

1. See, for example, J. Perkins's *Confessions of an Economic Hit Man* (San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc., 2004); *The Secret History of the American Empire: Economic Hit Men, Jackals, and the Truth about Global Corruption* (New York: Dutton, 2007); *Hoodwinked* (New York: Broadway Books, 2009). For a study of the history of the press and the market in the US, see J. T. Hamilton, *All the News That's Fit to Sell: How the Market Transforms Information into News* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004). For a critical view of American Empire and the press, see N. Solomon, *War Made Easy: How Presidents and Pundits Keep Spinning Us to Death* (Hoboken, NJ: J. Wiley, 2005). For a study of this specific to the events in Iraq see N. Mirzoeff, *Watching Babylon: The War in Iraq and Global Visual Culture* (New York and London: Routledge, 2005).
2. For scholarship on ritual, myth-making, and performance, I lean on a variety of works, chief among them V. Turner, *From Ritual to Theatre: The Human Seriousness of Play* (New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications, 1982); R. Schechner, *Between Theatre and Anthropology* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985); J. Campbell, *The Masks of God*, 4 vols (1959; New York: Penguin, 1985).
3. See Perkins, *Secret History*, p. 5. A collection of both popular and scholarly works on the deleterious effects of American Empire can be found at www.americanempireproject.com [accessed 14 March 2010]. These are in contrast to the works in support of American Empire, which can be found at the American Enterprise Institute website, www.aei.org [accessed 14 March 2010].
4. See, for example, N. Ferguson, *Empire* (London: Allen Lane, 2002); C. Maier, *Among Empires: American Ascendancy and Its Predecessors* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2006).
5. I adapt this definition from Perkins, *Secret History*, pp. 4–5.
6. K. Wilson, 'The Good, the Bad, and the Impotent: Imperialism and the Politics of Identity in Georgian England' in A. Bermingham and J. Brewer (eds), *The Consumption of*

- Culture, 1600–1800: Image, Object, Text* (London: Routledge, 1995), p. 237–62, both on p. 242.
7. L. Trilling, *The Liberal Imagination: Essays on Literature and Society* (New York: Viking Press, 1950); H. N. Smith, *Virgin Land: The American West as Symbol and Myth* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1950).
 8. Richard Slotkin has a series of anti-Turnerian studies: *Regeneration through Violence: The Myth of the American Frontier, 1600–1860* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1973); *Fatal Environment: The Myth of the Frontier in the Age of Industrialization, 1800–1890* (New York: Atheneum, 1985); *Gunfighter Nation: The Myth of the Frontier in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Atheneum, 1992); and most recently, *Lost Battalions: The Great War and the Crisis of American Nationality* (New York: Henry Holt, 2005). See also R. Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian: History of an Idea from Columbus to the Present* (New York: Knopf, 1978).
 9. F. Nussbaum, 'The Theatre of Empire: Radical Counterfeit, Racial Realism', in K. Wilson (ed.), *A New Imperial History: Culture, Identity, and Modernity in Britain and the Empire, 1660–1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 71–90; and edited with L. Brown, *The New Eighteenth Century: Theory, Politics, English Literature* (New York and London: Methuen, 1987); A. Kaplan and D. E. Pease (eds), *Cultures of United States Imperialism* (Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 1993); A. Doolen, *Fugitive Empire: Locating Early American Imperialism* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2005).
 10. W. Nugent, *Habits of Empire: A History of American Expansion* (New York: Knopf, 2008); F. Anderson and A. Cayton, *The Dominion of War: Empire and Liberty in North America, 1500–2000* (New York: Viking, 2005); A. Bacevich, *American Empire: The Realities and Consequences of US Diplomacy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002).
 11. C. Hall, *Cultures of Empire: Colonizers in Britain and the Empire in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries, A Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2000); Wilson (ed.), *A New Imperial History*, A. L. Stoler, *Haunted by Empire: Geographies of Intimacy in North American History* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006).
 12. C. Cumfer, *Separate Peoples, One Land: The Minds of Cherokees, Blacks, and Whites on the Tennessee Frontier* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2007); D. A. Nichols, *Red Gentlemen and White Savages: Indians, Federalists, and the Search for Order on the American Frontier* (Charlottesville, VA, and London: University of Virginia Press, 2008); D. V. Jones, *License for Empire: Colonialism by Treaty in Early America* (Chicago, IL, and London: University of Chicago Press, 1982).
 13. *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*, at <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/colonialism> [accessed 14 March 2010].
 14. R. L. Grimes, *Beginnings in Ritual Studies* (1982; Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1995), pp. 142–3; E. Rozik, *The Roots of Theatre: Rethinking Ritual and Other Theories of Origin* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2002). The debate on ritual and theatre and whether the latter arises from the former is voluminous. Rozik summarizes the debate in the introduction to this work.
 15. J.-C. Agnew, *Worlds Apart: The Market and the Theater in Anglo-American Thought, 1550–1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), pp. ix–xiv.
 16. A. I. Hallowell, especially 'Ojibwa Ontology, Behavior, and Worldview', in D. Tedlock and B. Tedlock (eds), *Teachings from the American Earth: Indian Religion and Philosophy* (New York: Liveright, 1975), pp. 158–61, and A. I. Hallowell, *Culture and Experience*

- (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955); F. Speck, *Naskapi: The Savage Hunters of the Labrador Peninsula* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1935); A. Tanner, *Bringing Home Animals: Religious Ideology and Mode of Production of the Mistassini Cree Hunters*, Institute of Social and Economic Research, Social and Economic Studies No. 23 (St John's, Newfoundland: Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1979); G. Weltfish, *The Lost Universe: Pawnee Life and Culture* (Lincoln, NE, and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1965); K. M. Morrison, *Solidarity of Kin: Ethnohistory, Religious Studies, and the Algonkian-French Religious Encounter* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2002); B. Saler, 'Conceptualizing Religion: Immanent Anthropologists, Transcendent Natives – and Unbounded Categories', in H. G. Kippenberg and E. T. Lawson (eds), *Studies in the History of Religions*, 56 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993), and B. Saler, 'Supernatural as a Western Category', *Ethos* 5:1 (1977), pp. 31–53; L. Irwin, *The Dream Seekers: Native American Visionary Traditions of the Great Plains* (Norman, OK and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994).
17. D. Scott, *Refashioning Futures: Criticism after Postcoloniality* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999), p. 12, quoted in C. Hall, 'Introduction', in Hall (ed.), *Cultures of Empire*, p. 1–36, on p. 5.
 18. The example is mine, drawn from a discussion of Hallowell's work by Morrison in *Solidarity of Kin*, pp. 47–8.
 19. R. Chartier, *Cultural History: Between Practices and Representations*, trans. L. G. Cochrane (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988), p. 5.
 20. B. McConachie and F. E. Hart (eds), *Performance and Cognition: Theatre Studies and the Cognitive Turn* (London and New York: Routledge, 2006).
 21. G. Lakoff and M. Johnson, *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought* (New York: Basic Books, 1999), quoted in F. E. Hart, 'Performance, Phenomenology, and the Cognitive Turn', in McConachie and Hart (eds), *Performance and Cognition*, pp. 29–51, on p. 34.
 22. Hart, 'Performance', pp. 36–7.
 23. For the complicated nature of minstrelsy, see W. T. Lhamon Jr, *Raising Cain: Blackface Performance from Jim Crow to Hip Hop* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998). For blackface and empire, the classic work is F. Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks* (1952; New York: Grove Press, 1967).
 24. B. McConachie, 'Cognitive Studies and Epistemic Competence in Cultural History: Moving Beyond Freud and Lacan', in McConachie and Hart (eds), *Performance and Cognition*, pp. 52–75, on p. 67.
 25. One can find movement in this direction among writers and scholars who share a concern for the environment. Dating to the 1864 publication of G. P. Marsh's *Man and Nature* (New York: C. Scribner, 1864), writers such as Marsh, Aldo Leopold, *A Sand County Almanac; and Sketches Here and There* (1949; New York: Oxford, 1987); Rachel Carson, *Silent Spring* (1962; Boston, MA and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1994); and most recently Wes Jackson, *Becoming Native to This Place, Rooted in the Land* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1994) have attempted to incorporate environmental sustainability and common sense into the Enlightenment rationalism of the colonial culture. Current policies and problems attest to their, present limited success.
 26. Quoted in P. Nabokov, *Where the Lightning Strikes: The Lives of American Indian Sacred Places* (New York: Penguin, 2006), pp. 10–11.

1 'Glory and Commerce' at the 'Edge of the Woods'

1. *Pennsylvania Gazette*, 20 December, 1756.
2. O. Johnson and W. Burling, *The Colonial American Stage, 1665–1774: A Documentary Calendar* (Madison and Teaneck, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2001), pp. 182–4; *Pennsylvania Gazette*, 20 December, 1756, p. 184.
3. Asser, *The Life of King Alfred, from A.D. 849–887*, available online at the Online Medieval and Classical Library, <http://omacl.org/KingAlfred/part1.html> [accessed 14 March 2010] and includes background information to the text [accessed 1 March 2010].
4. *Ibid.*, Part 2: <http://omacl.org/KingAlfred/part2.html> [accessed 1 March 2010].
5. For a discussion of these history plays and creating a British national mythology, see L. H. Marshall, *National Myth and Imperial Fantasy* (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008), pp. 18–47.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 40.
7. For examples, see C. Durang, *History of the Philadelphia Stage between the Years 1749 and 1855* (Philadelphia, PA: Philadelphia Sunday Dispatch, 1868; first published as a serial, 1852); A. H. Quinn, *A History of the American Drama from the Beginning to the Civil War* (New York: F. S. Crofts and Co., 1944); A. Hornblow, *A History of the Theatre in America: From Its Beginnings to the Present Time* (1919; New York, London: Benjamin Blom, 1965); H. F. Rankin, *The Theater in Colonial America* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1960); G. B. Wilson, *Three Hundred Years of American Drama and Theatre* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1982); W. J. Meserve, *An Emerging Entertainment: The Drama of the American People to 1828* (Bloomington, IN, and London: Indiana University Press, 1977).
8. For the subtle nature of theatre in Boston and colonial theatre generally, see O. Johnson, *Absence and Memory: Fiorelli's Plaster* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 93–144.
9. Quoted in R. Moody (ed.), *Dramas from the American Theatre, 1762–1909* (Cleveland, OH, and New York: The World Publishing Company, 1966), p. 1.
10. F. Hopkinson, *An Exercise Containing a Dialogue and Ode, On the Accession of His present gracious Majesty George III*, quoted in Moody (ed.), *Dramas from the American Theatre*, on p. 6.
11. The historical literature on this topic is voluminous; a good place to start is D. Armitage (ed.), *Theories of Empire, 1450–1800* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995).
12. K. Silverman, *A Cultural History of the American Revolution* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell and Co., 1976), p. 9 (quote), p. 242.
13. J. G. A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1975), especially Pt 3, pp. 333–552; C. Robbins, *The Eighteenth-Century English Commonwealthmen: Studies in the Transmission, Development and Circumstance of English Liberal Thought from the Restoration of Charles II until the War with the Thirteen Colonies* (1959; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961).
14. For the Atlantic crossing of classical republicanism, see B. Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1967), and Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment*.
15. The poem was 'Verses on the Prospect of Planting Arts and Learning in America', written in 1726 and published in 1752. Reproduced in Silverman, *A Cultural History of the American Revolution*, p. xix.

16. Quoted in Silverman, *A Cultural History of the American Revolution*, p. 10. The speaker got the gender of the muse wrong, however. Thalia, or Thaleia, was the muse of comedy and 'playful, idyllic poetry.' There is a 1739 painting of Thalia in the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco Museum by the French artist Jean-Marc Nattier. It is entitled, appropriately enough, 'Thalia, Muse of Comedy'. See <http://search.famsf.org:8080/view.shtml?record=64295&=list&=1&=thali> [accessed 1 March 2010]. See also E. O'Gorman, *The Invention of America: An Inquiry into the Historical Nature of the New World and the Meaning of Its History* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1961).
17. Quoted in R. M. Gummere, *The American Colonial Mind and the Classical Tradition: Essays in Comparative Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963), p. 2.
18. J. W. Burrow, *Whigs and Liberals: Continuity and Change in English Political Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988) studies some of this reification; as does J. G. A. Pocock in *Virtue, Commerce, and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); and Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment*.
19. The 'South Sea Bubble' was one of the first major financial scandals perpetrated in the emerging 'market society' of the British Empire. See, for example, M. Balen, *The Secret History of the South Sea Bubble: The World's First Great Financial Scandal* (London: Fourth Estate, 2003); J. Carswell, *The South Sea Bubble* (Dover, NH: Alan Sutton, 1993); P. M. Garber, *Famous First Bubbles: The Fundamentals of Early Manias* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000).
20. G. Lillo, 'Introduction' to *The London Merchant*, in G. Lillo, 'Dedication to Sir John Eyles', in *The London Merchant, or, The History of George Barnwell* (London, n.p., 1735), pp. v–vi.
21. This was not a new concept, but Bentham's development of it was unique. Among other things, he developed the difference between the individual and social 'hedonistic calculi'. He himself said he had taken the idea from Joseph Priestly, a 'rational dissenter' of eighteenth century Britain and supporter of the colonists' complaints under George III. See, for example, J. Steintrager, *Bentham* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977).
22. Lillo, 'Dedication', p. vi.
23. *Ibid.*, pp. vi–vii.
24. There is a version of the ballad, too extensive to reproduce here, at <http://www.umd.umich.edu/casl/hum/eng/classes/434/geweb/BALLADOF.htm> [accessed 14 March 2010], including a discussion of the differences between the ballad and the play.
25. Folk song scholar Francis Child indexes 'George Barnwell' as a song type originally collected as 'Young Redin', from one Miss E. Beattie, a native of the Mearnsheer region of Scotland. It is essentially the same story featuring a Scottish seaman. See F. Child, *English and Scottish Ballads* (New York: Phinney, Blakeman and Mason, 1860), p. 213. For further commentary on *The London Merchant*, see L. Fietz, 'On the Origins of English Melodrama in the Tradition of Bourgeois Tragedy and Sentimental Drama: Lillo, Schröder, Kotzebue, Sheridan, Thompson, Jerrold', in M. Hays and A. Nikolopoulou, *Melodrama: The Cultural Emergence of a Genre* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1996), pp. 83–102, on p. 84.
26. Fietz, 'On the Origins of English Melodrama', pp. 84, 91.
27. Described in D. K. Richter, *The Ordeal of the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1992), pp. 91–2.

28. P. Charlevoix, 'Letter XIX, June 30, 1721', in *Journal of a Voyage to North America*, 2 vols (London: R & J Dodsley, 1761), vol. 2, p. 44.
29. Hallowell, 'Ojibwa Ontology, Behavior, and World View'. For the implications for western interpretations of a paradigm that included 'other-than-human persons', what Hallowell calls ethno-metaphysics, see pp. 143–4; for problems with the nature / supernatural dichotomy in the indigenous paradigm, see p. 169; and P. Radin, 'Religion of the North American Indians', *Journal of American Folklore*, 27 (1914), p. 350.
30. Charlevoix, *Journal*, vol. 2, pp. 573–4; the Outagamies were better known as the Fox tribe. Indeed Charlevoix observed numerous ritual performances of the two Indian groups that came to be associated with each other: the Sac and Fox.
31. H. Hale (ed.), *The Iroquois Book of Rites* (New York: AMS Press, 1969; originally published Philadelphia, 1883), pp. 39–41.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 39.
33. *Ibid.*, pp. 62–4.
34. James Merrell makes this point in *The Indians' New World: Catawbas and Their Neighbors from European Contact through the Era of Removal* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1989), p. 63.
35. Examples can be found throughout the historical literature; one notable example is in the 'Proceedings of the Colonial Congress Held at Albany, June 1754', available online at <http://earlytreaties.unl.edu/treaty.00005.html>, page 862 [accessed 14 March 2010].
36. Retold in Richter, *Ordeal of the Longhouse*, p. 32.
37. V. Turner, 'Are There Universals of Performance in Myth, Ritual and Drama', in R. Schechner and W. Appel (eds), *By Means of Performance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 1–8, on p. 1.
38. Marshall, *National Myth*, p. 22.
39. A recent study of the Ohio Company is needed; the old standards are A. P. James, *The Ohio Company: Its Inner History* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1959); and K. P. Bailey, *The Ohio Company of Virginia and the Westward Movement, 1748–1792: A Chapter in the History of the Colonial Frontier* (Glendale, CA: Arthur H. Clark Co., 1939).
40. Among the more useful studies of this region, see M. N. McConnell, *A Country Between: The Upper Ohio Valley and Its Peoples, 1724–1774* (Lincoln, NE, and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1992); R. White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650–1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); A. R. L. Cayton and F. J. Teute (eds), *Contact Points: American Frontiers from the Mohawk Valley to the Mississippi, 1750–1830* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1998). For an excellent study of the 'middle ground' between the British and Maroon Towns in Jamaica, see K. Wilson, 'The Performance of Freedom: Maroons and the Colonial Order in Eighteenth-Century Jamaica and the Atlantic Sound', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, 66:1 (January 2009), pp. 45–86.
41. 'Chronology of Communications', p. xxvii, in L. Mulkearn (ed.), *George Mercer Papers Relating to the Ohio Company of Virginia* (Pittsburg, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1954); Alfred James arrived at this figure apparently by adding up the list of granted petitions for lands published in Mulkearn (ed.), *George Mercer Papers*, pp. 250–1; see James, *Ohio Company*, p. 26.
42. For an acknowledgement and discussion of the 'tricks of the archive', see D. Taylor, 'Scenes of Cognition: Performance and Conquest', *Theatre Journal*, 56 (2004), pp. 353–72.

43. 'Treaty of Lancaster, 1744', reproduced in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 13:2 (October 1905), p. 142. See the map by John Mitchell, 'America Septentrionale avec les routes, distances', *David Rumsey Collection*, 1756, online at www.davidrumsey.com [accessed 1 March 2010]. This map is a French engraving of Mitchell's map of North America and shows Virginia Colony extending beyond the Wabash River. It is curious that the French would allow such a claim to be printed in this, the opening year of the Seven Years War. In the minutes of the Albany Congress of 1754, the British Crown's claim to the land from sea to sea is reiterated; available online at <http://earlytreaties.unl.edu/treaty.00005.html>, p. 885 [accessed 1 March 2010].
44. 'Treaty of Lancaster, 1744', pp. 141–2.
45. Summarized in the editor's 'Commentary' in Mulkearn (ed.), *George Mercer Papers*, pp. 399–400.
46. 'Ratified treaty #1: The Great Treaty of 1722 Between the Five Nations, the Mahicans, and the Colonies of New York, Virginia, and Pennsylvania', in E. B. O'Callaghan (ed.), *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York*, 11 vols (Albany, NY: Weed, Parsons, and Co., 1855), vol. 5. pp. 657–81, on pp. 660, 671, available at <http://earlytreaties.unl.edu/treaty.00001.html> [accessed 2 March 2010].
47. 'Ratified treaty #3: A Treaty Held at the Town of Lancaster, By the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of the Province, and the Honourable the Commissioners for the Province of Virginia and Maryland, with the Indians of the Six Nations in June, 1744', in C. Van Doren and J. P. Boyd (eds), *Indian Treaties Printed by Benjamin Franklin, 1736–1762* (Philadelphia, PA: The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1938), pp. 41–79, on p. 45, at <http://earlytreaties.unl.edu/treaty.00003.html> [accessed 14 March 2010]
48. *Ibid.*, p. 46.
49. *Ibid.*, pp. 50–3.
50. *Instructions Given Mr. Christopher Gist by the Committee of the Ohio Company the 11th Day of September 1750*, in W. M. Darlington (ed.), *Christopher Gist's Journals* (Pittsburgh, PA: J. R. Weldin & Co., 1893), pp. 31–2.
51. Mulkearn (ed.), *George Mercer Papers*, p. 2.
52. *Instructions Given Mr. Christopher Gist*, p. 34.
53. Mulkearn (ed.), *George Mercer Papers*, p. 408.
54. Cited in James, *The Ohio Company*, p. 21.
55. *Instructions Given Mr. Christopher Gist*, pp. 231–4; Bailey, *The Ohio Company*, p. 129; James, *The Ohio Company*, p. 65, James quote in n. 21.
56. 'Treaty of Logg's Town', in *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 13:2 (October 1905), pp. 143–74, on p. 157.
57. Mulkearn (ed.), *George Mercer Papers*, p. 273.
58. 'Treaty of Logg's Town', pp. 165–7.
59. For an elaboration of this situation among the Miamis, see R. D. Edmunds, 'Old Briton', in Edmunds (ed.), *American Indian Leaders: Studies in Diversity* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1980), pp. 1–20.
60. *Ibid.*, p. 168.
61. *Ibid.*, p. 161.
62. *Ibid.*, p. 169.
63. *Ibid.*, quote p. 171; post-signing statement by Tanaghrisson, p. 173.
64. Summarized in James, *The Ohio Country*, pp. 90–1.
65. Quoted in J. M. Faragher, *Daniel Boone: The Life and Legend of an American Pioneer* (New York: Henry Holt, 1992), p. 34.

66. Mulkearn (ed.), *George Mercer Papers*, p. 569; for a summary of the Miami–French conflict at Pickawillany, see Edmunds, ‘Old Briton’.
67. For the French view of Celeron’s expedition, see *A Memorial containing a summary of facts with their Authorities in Answer to the Observations Sent by the English Ministry to the Courts of Europe*, translator unknown (London: J. Parker and W. Weyman, 1757).
68. ‘Letter: Lords of Trade to Albany Commissioners, 18 September 1753; read at the opening session of the Albany Congress, 19 June 1754.’ New York Papers, Bundle Kk., No. 20, p. 853; available online at <http://earlytreaties.unl.edu/treaty.00005.html> [accessed 2 March 2010]. At least one historian deemed this attack to be the true opening of the Fourth French – Indian War; see James, *Ohio Company*, p. 70.
69. ‘Letter: Lords of Trade to Albany Commissioners’, p. 856.
70. *Ibid.*, pp. 865–6.
71. *Ibid.*, pp. 867–8. For the incident with the stick see p. 869.
72. *Ibid.*, pp. 870–1. Regarding the Monongahela Road, upon which General William Braddock would meet his infamous end, see *Instructions Given Mr. Christopher Gist*, pp. 71–7; Bailey, *The Ohio Company*, pp. 97–9.
73. For example, see James, *The Ohio Company*, pp. 60–80. This chapter, ‘Climax of Activity’, is primarily devoted to the activity of Secretary George Mason filing lawsuits on behalf of the Ohio Company against their clients. Nearly one-third of this biography of the company is taken up with that kind of ‘activity’.
74. ‘At a Committee of the Ohio Company at Mr. Mercer’s at Marlborough in Stafford County, February 6th 1753’, letter from the Committee to John Pagan Merch’t, in Mulkearn (ed.), *George Mercer Papers*, pp. 145–7. The Naturalization Act of 1705 gave the colonial governor the power to grant citizenship to foreign immigrants who agreed to take the necessary oaths of allegiance. Hening’s *Statutes*, III, pp. 434–5, in Mulkearn (ed.), *George Mercer Papers*, pp. 621–2, n. 564.
75. Noted in the *George Mercer Papers*, p. 72. When ‘Old Briton’, who had become an ‘overmighty subject’ to the French because of his attachment to British traders, was killed the previous summer, it ended the association of the Indians at Pickawillany with the English. These were the Indians that were to have received a portion of the British ‘payment’ at Logstown but were attacked by the French and their allies before the goods could be delivered.
76. For a summary of these events, see White, *The Middle Ground*, pp. 223–68.
77. McConnell, *A Country Between*, p. 132.
78. ‘Letter: Lords of Trade to Albany Commissioners’, p. 877.
79. For discussion of these schemes, see McConnell, *A Country Between*, p. 132; R. Middleton, *Pontiac’s War: Its Causes, Course and Consequences* (New York: Routledge, 2007), pp. 27–9. For a succinct summary of the situation, see the exchange of letters between Col. Henry Bouquet, Gen. Jeffrey Amherst, and Virginia Lt Gov. Francis Fauquier at http://www.heritage.nf.ca/law/lab6/labvol6_3087.html [accessed 2 March 2010].

2 The Corn Mother and ‘Rising Glory’

1. Thus summation of the ‘Green Corn Ceremony’ performances is drawn from John Howard Payne’s 1835 account of one of the last busk performances of the Cherokees before their removal, paraphrased in J. Witthoft, *Green Corn Ceremonialism in the Eastern Woodlands* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1949), pp. 63–8; William Bartram’s c. 1790 account in *Travels through North and South Carolina, Geor-*

- gia, *East and West Florida ... Together with Observations on the Manner of the Indians* (Philadelphia, PA: James and Johnson, 1791), pp. 509–10, available at <http://docsouth.unc.edu/nc/bartram/bartram.html> [accessed 3 March 2010].
2. For a discussion of the ‘going to water’ ritual, see A. E. Kilpatrick, ‘“Going to the Water”: A Structural Analysis of Cherokee Purification Rituals’, *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 15:3 (1991), pp. 49–58.
 3. Witthoft, *Green Corn Ceremonialism*, p. 65.
 4. J. Alder, *The Captivity of Jonathan Alder and His Life with the Indians*, transcribed by H. Alder, ed. O. E. Brown (Alliance, OH: Orley Brown, 1965), pp. 46–7.
 5. Witthoft, *Green Corn Ceremonialism*, p. 68; Alder, *The Captivity of Jonathan Alder*, p. 48.
 6. Alder, *The Captivity of Jonathan Alder*, p. 40.
 7. For French gift-giving, see W. R. Jacobs, *Dispossessing the American Indian: Indians and Whites on the Colonial Frontier* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1972), pp. 50–8; for British troubles, see W. R. Jacobs, *Dispossessing the American Indian: Indians and Whites on the Colonial Frontier* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1972), pp. 75–82.
 8. For more on Neolin’s vision, see C. E. Hunter, ‘The Delaware Nativist Revival of the Mid-Eighteenth Century’, *Ethnohistory*, 18:1 (Winter, 1971), pp. 39–49; Middleton, *Pontiac’s War*, pp. 61–4; G. E. Dowd, *War under Heaven: Pontiac, the Indian Nations, and the British Empire* (Baltimore, MD and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), 101–2; McConnell, *A Country Between*, pp. 220–2.
 9. J. Kenny, ‘Journal of James Kenny, 1761–63’ in *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 37:2 (1913), pp. 152–201, on p. 172.
 10. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
 11. J. McCullough, *A Narrative of the Captivity of John McCullough, Esq.* in A. Loudon (ed.), *A Selection of Narratives of Outrages Committed by the Indians in Their Wars with the White People*, 111 vols (Carlisle, PA: A. Loudon, 1808), Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, vol. 29 (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1977), pp. 324–5.
 12. *Ibid.*, pp. 321–3.
 13. *Ibid.*, pp. 324–5.
 14. Hunter, ‘The Delaware Nativist Revival’, pp. 40–1.
 15. Kenny, ‘Journal of James Kenny’, pp. 196.
 16. Quoted in Middleton, *Pontiac’s War*, p. 93; see also E. P. Hamilton (trans. and ed.), *Adventure in the Wilderness: The American Journals of Louis Antoine de Bougainville, 1756–1760* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1964), p. 55.
 17. Tanner, *Bringing Home Animals*. For other fieldwork studies of these kinds of rituals, see Speck, *Naskapi*.
 18. For a discussion of the implications of the evolution of a male war god out of a female-based agricultural mythology, see Campbell, *The Masks Of God*, vol. 3, pp. 84–5.
 19. Letter: George Croghan to William Johnson, 12 March 1763, *WJP*, vol. 4, pp. 62.
 20. For a brief history of the game, see E. B. McCluny, ‘Lacrosse: Combat of the Spirits’, *American Indian Quarterly*, 1:1 (Spring 1974), pp. 34–42.
 21. A. Henry, *Travels and Adventures in Canada and the Indian Territories between the Years 1760 and 1766* (Boston, MA: Little, Brown, and Co., 1901), pp. 76–80.
 22. V. Turner has written much about the ‘luminal’ in performance; for example see *The Anthropology of Performance* (New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications, 1986), pp. 25–6, 34–5, 41, 101, 107.

23. J. H. Richards, *Theatre Enough: American Culture and the Metaphor of the World Stage, 1607–1789* (Durham, NC, and London: Duke University Press, 1991); See also J. Weisman, *Guerilla Theatre: Scenarios for Revolution* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Press, 1973); S. Davis, *Parades and Power: Street Theater in Nineteenth-Century Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1986); D. Waldstreicher, *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes*. See also the essays in W. Pencak (ed.), *Riot and Revelry in Early America* (University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2002); and M. D. Jacob and J. R. Jacob (eds), *The Origins of Anglo-American Radicalism* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1984).
24. J.-J. Rousseau, *Politics and the Arts: Letter to M. D'Alembert on the Theatre*, trans. Allan Bloom (Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1960), quoted in Richards, *Theatre Enough*, p. 207.
25. Bernard Bailyn has analysed the source areas of the colonial population in *Voyagers to the West: A Passage in the Peopling of America Just Prior to the Revolution* (New York: Knopf, 1986).
26. See A. Taylor, *American Colonies* (New York: Viking, 2001), pp. 436–7; Jacobs, 'British Colonial Attitudes and Policies toward the Indian', pp. 85.
27. *The Paxton Boys, A Farce*, translated from the original French by 'A Native of Dingall', 1764 (*Three Centuries of Drama: America, 1714–1830*). I have found nothing connecting this to an original French version other than the claim of translation.
28. P. Gilje, *Rioting in America* (Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press, 1996), p. 22.
29. Letter: William Johnson to Cadwallader Colden, 29 May 1765, *WJP*, vol. 4, pp. 746–9; see also Jones, *License for Empire*, p. 75.
30. For a good discussion on the 'confused' nature of treaty conferences during this era, see J. Merrell, *Into the American Woods: Negotiators on the Pennsylvania Frontier* (New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1999), pp. 253–301.
31. Letter: Secretary of State Earl of Shelburne to William Johnson, *WJP*, vol. 6, pp. 22–3.
32. For a treaty meeting with the Mohawks of Canajoharies 'castle' regarding the Klock affair, see *WJP*, vol. 4, pp. 50–61; for complaints by whites in the Kayadosseras Patent, see Letter: John Morin Scott to Johnson, 13 July, 1768, *WJP*, vol. 6, p. 212.
33. For example see William Johnson to Baynton, Wharton and Morgan, 30 January 1766, *WJP*, vol. 5, p. 16.
34. See Bailey, *The Ohio Company*, pp. 233–7; P. Marshall, 'Lord Hillsborough, Samuel Wharton and the Ohio Grant, 1769–1775', *English Historical Review*, 80:317 (October 1965), pp. 717–39, on pp. 717–18.
35. 'Proceedings of Sir William Johnson with the Indians at Fort Stanwix to settle a Boundary Line' in E. B. O'Callaghan (ed.), *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York* (Albany, NY: Weed, Parsons, and Co., 1857), vol. 8, pp. 115–17, on p. 117. Available online at <http://earlytreaties.unl.edu/treaty.00007.html> [accessed 14 March 2010].
36. See, for example, Letter: Earl of Shelburne to Johnson, 13 September 1766, *WJP*, vol. 5, pp. 374–5; Shelburne to Johnson, 19 February 1767, *WJP*, vol. 5, pp. 492–3; also Letter: Board of Trade to the Earl of Hillsborough, 17 March 1768, in E. B. O'Callaghan (ed.), *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York* (Albany, NY: Weed, Parsons, and Co., 1857) vol. 8, pp. 19–31.
37. See Bailey, *The Ohio Company*, pp. 236–8, 239n.
38. For an excellent summary of the politics of ratification, see Marshall, 'Lord Hillsborough'; see also Middleton, *Pontiac's War*; for a study of the geo-politics of this time and place, see White, *The Middle Ground*, pp. 269–365.

39. For example, see letters, Gage to Johnson, 5 May 1766, and Johnson to Gage, 17 May 1766, *WJP*, vol. 5, pp. 201, 216.
40. For discussions of proposed western colonies, see McConnell, *A Country Between*, pp. 255–82.
41. The activities of the Loyal Company after the Lochaber treaty are covered in D. M. Friedenberg, *Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Land: The Plunder of Early America* (Buffalo, NY: Prometheus, 1992), pp. 115–16; for the Ohio country see McConnell, *A Country Between*, pp. 253–82; also Letter: William Johnson to General Thomas Gage, 19 September 1771, *WJP*, vol. 7, pp. 258–62.
42. H. H. Brackenridge and P. Freneau, *A Poem on the Rising Glory of America: Being an Exercise Delivered at the Public Commencement at Nassau-Hall, September 25 1771* (Philadelphia, PA: Joseph Cruikshank, 1772). This analysis is based on the full version of the poem found in the Readex Microprint series, *Three Centuries of Drama: American, 1714–1830*.
43. Brackenridge and Freneau, 'A Poem', p. 4.
44. Letter: General Jeffrey Amherst to Colonel Henry Bouquet, 16 July 1763, *British Manuscript Project*, Library of Congress. See also W. Trent, *Journal of Captain William Trent from Logstown to Pickawillany, A.D. 1752* (1871; New York: Arno Press, 1971). Trent's recording of his trading smallpox-infested handkerchiefs to Indians occurs in May, two months before Amherst's letter advocating the use of smallpox-infested blankets. Both documents can be viewed at http://www.nativeweb.org/pages/legal/amherst/lord_jeff.html [accessed 14 March 2010].
45. For another view of how Carthage was seen by educated Anglo-Americans, see C. Winterer, 'Model Empire, Lost City: Ancient Carthage and the Science of Politics in Revolutionary America', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, 67:1 (January 2010), pp. 3–30. For Cato, see Plutarch, 'The Life of Cato the Elder', in *The Parallel Lives* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914), pp. 303–85, on p. 383.
46. J. G. A. Pocock, 'Varieties of Whiggism', in Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce and History*, pp. 215–310, on p. 217; Robbins, *The Eighteenth-Century English Commonwealthmen*.
47. See Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment*.
48. Pocock, 'Varieties of Whiggism', p. 218.
49. White, *The Middle Ground*, pp. 372–3.
50. http://www.nativeweb.org/pages/legal/amherst/lord_jeff.html [accessed 4 April 2010]
51. H. Hamilton, *The Journal of Henry Hamilton*, in J. D. Barnhart (ed.), *Henry Hamilton and George Rogers Clark in the American Revolution* (Crawfordville, IN: R. E. Banta, 1951), pp. 7–244, on pp. 109–10.
52. Ibid.
53. See, for example, Alder, *The Captivity of Jonathan Alder*; for the reverse see R. Wilson, *Ohiyesa: Charles Eastman, Santee Sioux* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1983).
54. Hamilton, *The Journal of Henry Hamilton* p. 110.
55. Ibid., p. 111.
56. Ibid., pp. 111–12.
57. Ibid., p. 121. Minor anomalies in punctuation and spelling have been corrected.
58. Ibid., pp. 127–8.
59. Ibid., p. 140.
60. Ibid., p. 145.
61. Section 8 of the 'Non-Importation Act', First Continental Congress, 1774, quoted in B. Hewitt, *Theatre U.S.A., 1665–1957* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959).

62. A. Gilman (ed.), *Theatrum Majorum ... with Which is Incorporated Extracts from the Diary of Dorothy Dudley* (Cambridge: Lockwood, Brooks and Company, 1876), p. 53.
63. *New England Chronicle; or, the Essex Gazette*, 21–8 December 1775, quoted in J. Brown, *The Theatre in America during the Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 27.
64. Gilman (ed.), *Theatrum Majorum*, p. 53; see also Brown, *Theater in America*, pp. 26–9.
65. F. Jennings, *The Ambiguous Iroquois Empire: The Covenant Chain Confederation of Indian Tribes with English Colonies from Its Beginnings to the Lancaster Treaty of 1744* (New York: Norton, 1984), p. 176.
66. Jennings, *The Ambiguous Iroquois Empire*, pp. 284–5, 298, 353.
67. G. Ewing, *The Military Journal of George Ewing*, available with information about Ewing at the family website, <http://www.sandcastles.net/george.htm> [accessed 14 March 2010]. See also T. C. Pollock, *The Philadelphia Theatre in the Eighteenth Century* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1933), p. 37; and Brown, *Theater in America*, pp. 57–59.
68. Quoted in Pollock, *The Philadelphia Theatre*, p. 37; and Brown, *Theater in America*, p. 59.
69. Brown notes a smattering of plays in New York, Philadelphia, and New Hampshire performed by the continental officers before Yorktown. See Brown, *Theater in America*, pp. 174–5.
70. Summaries can be found in Silverman, *A Cultural History of the American Revolution*, pp. 333–7, and R. M. Hatch, *Major John André: A Gallant in Spy's Clothing* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1986), pp. 87–108. For a broader view of the Philadelphia occupation, see J. W. Jackson, *With the British Army in Philadelphia 1777–1778* (San Rafael, CA, and London: Presidio Press, 1979).
71. Becky Franks' letters are published in 'Letters of Becky Franks', *Magazine of History and Biography*, 16 (1892), pp. 216–18.
72. For Howe's career in North America, see M. Jones, 'Sir William Howe: Conventional Strategist', in G. Billias (ed.), *George Washington's Opponents: British generals and admirals in the American Revolution* (New York: Morrow, 1969), pp. 39–72.
73. For a biography of Germain, see A. Valentine, *Lord George Germain* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962).
74. Major J. André, 'Particulars of the Mischianza in America', *Gentleman's Magazine* 48 (1778), p. 355–6, on p. 355.
75. *Ibid.*, p. 355–6.
76. *Ibid.*, p. 356. William Shaw Cathcart, son of the ninth Baron Cathcart of the Scottish peerage, eventually became the *aide-de-camp* of Sir Henry Clinton. His American wife was Elizabeth Elliot (daughter of Andrew Elliot, a rich and influential Tory), who eventually became a lady-in-waiting of Queen Charlotte after the war. See R. D. Bass, *The Green Dragoon: The Lives of Banastre Tarlton and Mary Robinson* (New York: Henry Holt, 1947); and Sir L. Stephen and Sir S. Lee (eds), *The Dictionary of National Biography*, 22 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1882), vol. 3, pp. 1196–7.
77. For a more complete account of the festivities see Brown, *Theater in America*, pp. 51–6. Another recounting of the event with links to further information can be accessed at <http://home.golden.net/~marg/bansite/banecdotes/80mischianza.html#f17>.
78. 'Minutes of Society of Friends Yearly Meeting, 1758', quoted in F. Jennings, *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest* (1975; New York: Norton, 1976), p. 165.

79. G. B. Nash, *The Urban Crucible: The Northern Seaports and the Era of the American Revolution*, abridged edition (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986), pp. 43, 66. See also W. F. Dunaway, *The Scotch-Irish of Colonial Pennsylvania* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1944); R. J. Dickson, *Ulster Emigration to Colonial America, 1718–1775* (Belfast: Ulster Historical Foundation, 1988).
80. C. H. Hart, 'Mary White – Mrs. Robert Morris', *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 2:1 (1878), pp. 162–3.
81. J. T. Scharf and T. Westcott, *History of Philadelphia, 1609–1884*, 3 vols (Philadelphia, PA: L.H. Everts and Co., 1884), vol. 2, pp. 898–9.
82. Silverman, *A Cultural History of the American Revolution*, p. 406.
83. *Ibid.*, pp. 251–2.
84. A reference to a line in Hugh Henry Brackenridge and Philip Freneau's commencement poem cited above.

3 Thunderbirds and Happy Indians

1. Alder, *The Captivity of Jonathan Alder*, p. 53.
2. For more information on Baily, see A. M. Clerke, 'Francis Baily', *Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 1, pp. 899–904; J. F. W. Herschel, 'Mémorial of Francis Baily, Esq.', in F. Baily, *Journal of a Tour in Unsettled Parts of North America in 1796 and 1797* (London: Baily Brothers, 1856), pp. 1–60; and J. D. L. Holmes (ed.), 'Introduction', in the second printing of the *Journal* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1969), pp. xvii–xxiv.
3. 'Kentucky Boat' was the term often used for flat-bottomed barges carrying good and migrants down the river. They were not meant to make the return trip. See Baily, *Journal of a Tour in Unsettled Parts*, p. 152.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 190.
5. Hallowell, 'Ojibwa Ontology, Behavior, and World View', pp. 155–8.
6. H. S. Manley, *The Treaty of Fort Stanwix 1784* (Rome, NY: Rome Sentinel Company, 1932), p. 15.
7. Quoted in Nichols, *Red Gentlemen*, p. 28.
8. 'Sutlers' were traders working out of the fort.
9. Nichols, *Red Gentlemen*, p. 29; 'Journal of Griffith Evans', H. F. Raup (ed.), *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 65:2 (April 1941), pp. 205–06.
10. Nichols, *Red Gentlemen*, p. 33; J. Heart, *Journal of Captain Jonathan Heart*, ed. W. Butterfield (Albany, NY: Joel Munsells Sons, 1885), p. 53.
11. For 'pigmocracy' see I. Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone: the First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1998), p. 9; for skin colour as a property right see, for example, N. Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White* (New York: Routledge, 1995).
12. This particular observation was inspired by C. Graña, 'Art and the American Republic', pp. 112–24 in his *Fact and Symbol: Essays in the Sociology of Art and Literature* (New York: Oxford, 1971). Graña was critiquing Neil Harris's *The Artist in American Society: The Formative Years, 1790–1860* (New York: George Braziller, 1966), specifically Harris's failure to mention the egalitarian nature of American society during this period. But, as with so many historians who discuss the political economics of this era, for example the spectrum contained in the works from A. Kulikoff, *The Agrarian Origins of American Capitalism* (Charlottesville, VA, and London: University of Virginia Press, 1992)

- to W. Rothenberg, *From Marketplaces to Market Economy: The Transformation of Rural Massachusetts, 1750–1850* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1992), cultural historians also tend to neglect the complexity and conflation of race and class.
13. D. B. Wilmeth (ed.), *Staging the Nation: Plays from the American Theater, 1787–1909* (Boston, MA: Bedford Books, 1998), p. 11. See also B. W. Dippie, *The Vanishing American: White Attitudes and U.S. Indian Policy* (Lawrence, KT: University Press of Kansas, 1982).
 14. Wilmeth *Staging the Nation*, pp. 16–17.
 15. J. D. Schoepf, *Travels in the Confederation, 1783–1784, from the German of Johann David Schoepf*, ed. A. J. Morrison (1788; New York: Morrow, 1968), pp. 151–3. The official website of the Gnadenhütten Massacre reports twenty-eight men, twenty-nine women, and thirty-nine children: <http://www.ohiohistorycentral.org/entry.php?rec=499> [accessed 14 March 2010].
 16. For a study of the career of Brother Jonathan, see W. Morgan, *An American Icon: Brother Jonathan and American Identity* (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 1988). Morgan points to ‘Yankee Doodle’ as a kind of ‘pre-Jonathan’, who is eventually, after the Civil War, replaced by ‘Uncle Sam’.
 17. Wilmeth *Staging the Nation* pp. 34–6.
 18. W. Dunlap, *History of the American Theatre*, 2 vols (1832; New York: Burt Franklin, 1963), vol. 1, pp. 136–7.
 19. For a discussion of Euro-American views of blacks during this period, see W. Jordan, *White over Black: American Attitudes toward the Negro, 1550–1812* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press for the Omahundro Institute for Early American History and Culture, 1968), especially pp. 482–511.
 20. Dunlap was a member of New York’s Manumission Society and served as ‘deputy’ to the convention of Abolition Societies in Philadelphia in 1797. Dunlap wrote that what was ‘morally right cannot be politically wrong’ and called for abolition among the southern states as France had done with the West Indies. He goes on to quote the French statesman Condorcet, who said it was better to ‘Perish over West Indian Islands rather than we should depart from the principles of justice!’ But liberating slaves, Dunlap argued, does not restore them to their original condition – colonization societies were replacing abolitionists ‘who are to be blessed for beginning the good work’. See Dunlap, *History*, vol. 1, pp. 323, 327–8; and Robert H. Canary, *William Dunlap* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1970).
 21. John Henry of the Old American Company ‘blackened up’ for Othello and Dunlap, who had seen the London versions of these plays as well, said Henry was the best in this part. See Dunlap, *History*, vol. 1, p. 155.
 22. Dunlap, *History*, vol. 1, pp. 133–4.
 23. G. Coleman, *Incle and Yarico: An Opera, printed from the acting copy, with remarks, biographical and critical, by D—G* (London: John Cumberland, n.d.), reprinted in E. Inchbald (ed.), *British Theater; or a collection of plays which are acted at Theatres Royal, Drury Lane, Covent Garden, and Haymarket*, 25 vols (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, 1808) vol. 2, pp. 640–57. Elizabeth Inchbald, a well-known actress of the day, is the commentator D—G. Mrs Inchbald, as she was popularly known, like Dunlap, adapted a number of August von Kotzebue’s works for the English stage. These volumes have page numbers only for individual plays, not for the entire volume.
 24. *Ibid.*, p. 11.
 25. *Ibid.*, pp. 2–10.

26. Ibid., p. 17.
27. Ibid., p. 19.
28. Ibid., p. 20.
29. I am referring of course to the fact that tobacco was an indigenous plant of the Americas and the Europeans got it from the Native Americans. For 'Columbian Exchange' see A. W. Crosby, *The Columbian Exchange: Biological and Cultural Consequences of 1492* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1972).
30. Coleman, *Inkle and Yarico*, p. 24.
31. Ibid., pp. 20–1.
32. R. Steele, 'Inkle and Yarico', in *Spectator*, 13 March 1711. A collection of the various versions of this story can be found in F. Felsenstein (ed.), *English Trader, Indian Maid: Representing Gender, Race, and Slavery in the New World, an Inkle and Yarico Reader* (Baltimore, MD, and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999).
33. Inchbald, *British Theater*, vol. 4, p. vii.
34. *Charleston Morning Post*, 16 January 1786, quoted in E. Willis, *The Charleston Stage in the XVIII Century* (Columbia, SC: The State Company, 1924), pp. 95–6.
35. Ibid., p. 177.
36. Willis, *The Charleston Stage*, pp. 247–8, 277–8; *Americana, or, a New Tale of the Genii* (Baltimore, MD: W. Pechin, 1802); and W. S. Hoole, *The Ante-Bellum Charleston Theatre* (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama, 1946), xviii. Theatre, Hoole notes, has been left out of the historical literature on southern culture. There is not much recent material on the topic of theatre in the South. For Charleston, see M. J. Curtis, 'The Early Charleston Theatre, 1703–1798' (PhD dissertation, University of Indiana, 1968). For Richmond see M. S. Shockley, *The Richmond Stage, 1784–1812* (Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1977); for New Orleans, a work that treats primarily the nineteenth century and attributes the origins of theatre there to French refugees from the rebellion in Santo Domingo, see N. Smither, *A History of the English Theatre in New Orleans* (1944; New York: Benjamin Blom, 1967), p. 7. On the origins of New Orleans theatre, Smither cites N. W. Price, 'Le Spectacle de la Rue St Pierre', *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, 1:3 (January 1918), pp. 221–3.
37. For Moultrie's military career, see J. Buchanan, *The Road to Guilford Courthouse: The American Revolution in the Carolinas* (New York: Wiley, 1997), pp. 6–16, 39, 48, 71.
38. 'Music Notes: City Opera Records *Candide*', *New York Times*, 9 June 1985.
39. See T. Postlewait, 'From Melodrama to Realism: The Suspect History of American Drama', in M. Hays and A. Nikopoulou, *Melodrama: The Cultural Emergence of a Genre* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1996), pp. 39–60; and Fietz, 'On the Origins of English Melodrama', pp. 83–102.
40. Dunlap, *History*, vol. 1, 160–1.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid.
43. Ibid.
44. J. K. Paulding, *American Quarterly Review* 2 (1828), quoted in Dunlap, *History*, vol. 1, p. 163.
45. See the entry for 'Hatton, Ann' in V. Blain, P. Clements, and I. Grundy (eds), *The Feminist Companion to Literature in English: Women Writers from the Middle Ages to the Present* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990), pp. 498–99.
46. Dunlap, *History*, vol. 1, p. 213.

47. Dunlap, *History*, vol. 1, p. 209; for dates of performance, see <http://www.ibdb.com/production.asp?ID=13441#Tammany>.
48. Dunlap, *History* vol. 1, p. 220. For a reconstruction of the Tammany legend that is rather mystifying in its own right, see J. W. Norwood, *The Tammany Legend: Tamanend* (Boston, MA: Meador Publishing, 1938). This book is perhaps the ultimate conflation of American democracy with indigenous culture, and indicates the power of this connection in the long term.
49. See S. L. Porter, *With an Air Debonair: Musical Theatre in America, 1785–1815* (Washington, DC, and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991), p. 13.
50. A. J. (Kemble) Hatton, *The Songs of Tammany, or, The Indian Chief: A Serious Opera* (New York: Harisson and Faulkner, 1794). Also available on Early American Imprint Series, Evans 27100, pp. 1–7.
51. For reference to ‘White Indians’ in the West by eastern military people, see Nichols, *Red Gentlemen*, W. Hogeland, *The Whiskey Rebellion: George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, and the Frontier Rebels Who Challenged America’s Newfound Sovereignty* (New York: Scribner, 2006), p. 211. See also T. P. Slaughter, *The Whiskey Rebellion: Frontier Epilogue to the American Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986). (White Indians)?
52. Dunlap, *History*, vol. 1, p. 212.
53. *Ibid.*
54. D. A. Grind, Jr, and B. E. Johansen, *Exemplars of Liberty: Native America and the Evolution of Democracy* (Los Angeles: UCLA Native American Studies Centre, 1991), Chapter 9, ‘The American Synthesis’; Norwood, *The Tammany Legend*.
55. (Please begin this note with page reference etc. for the citation) G. Vernon, *Yankee Doodle-Do: A Collection of Songs of the Early American Stage* (New York: Payson and Clarke, Ltd., 1927), p. 30. For a generalized overview of the music of this period, see J. Ogasapian, *Music of the Colonial and Revolutionary Era* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2004).
56. Hatton, *Songs of Tammany*, pp. 9–13.
57. *Ibid.*, pp. 13–14.
58. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
59. Quoted in Dippie, *The Vanishing American*, p. 4.
60. Dunlap, *History*, vol. 1, p. 312.
61. *Ibid.*
62. Moody (ed.), *Dramas from the American Theatre*, p. 62; Dunlap, *History*, vol. 1, p. 313; G. Strand, ‘The Theater and the Republic’, in J. D. Mason, *Performing America: Cultural Nationalism in the American Theatre* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press), pp. 19–36. For the Irish uprising of 1798, see N. J. Curtin, *The United Irishmen: Popular Politics in Ulster and Dublin, 1791–1798* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).
63. P. S. Onuf, *Jefferson’s Empire: The Language of American Nationhood* (Charlottesville, VA, and London: University Press of Virginia, 2000), pp. 24–5.
64. Moody (ed.), *Dramas from the American Theatre*, pp. 70–1.
65. W. W. Clapp, Jr, *A Record of the Boston Stage* (Boston and Cambridge, MA: James Munroe and Company, 1853), pp. 36–7.
66. See *Bunker-Hill or, The Death of General Warren*, in Moody (ed.), *Dramas from the American Theatre*, pp. 70–86. The Manichean genre of melodrama was on the rise during this period of American theatre and would only increase for the next several generations.
67. Strand, ‘The Theatre and the Republic’, pp. 25–8; Moody (ed.), *Dramas from the American Theatre*, p. 62.

68. Dunlap, *History*, vol. 1, pp. 313–15.
69. Solee was quite influential in Charleston, South Carolina, managing the French, or Church Street, Theatre in that city. He represents another theatre person who worked in that grey area between circus and theatre. See Willis, *The Charleston Stage*, pp. 237, 256.
70. *Ibid.*, pp. 370–1.
71. Dunlap, *History*, vol. 2, p. 20.
72. Moody (ed.), *Dramas from the American Theatre*, p. 95.
73. *Ibid.*, p. 101.
74. *Ibid.*, p. 98.
75. *Ibid.*, p. 99.
76. *Ibid.*, pp. 113–14, the diminutive spellings are in the original.
77. White, *The Middle Ground*, p. 378.
78. L. Conner, *Pittsburgh in Stages* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2007), p. 5.
79. Hogeland, *The Whiskey Rebellion*, p. 20.
80. Hogeland has a succinct summary of Morris and Hamilton's plans for paying for Pennsylvania's part of the war debt through a tax on whiskey on pp. 27–70. Hogeland leans heavily on E. J. Ferguson, *The Power of the Purse: A History of American Public Finance, 1776–1790* (Charlotte, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1961). See also S. Elkins and E. McKittrick, *The Age of Federalism* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), pp. 462–81; S. R. Boyd, *The Whiskey Rebellion: Past and Present Perspectives* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1985); Slaughter, *The Whiskey Rebellion*; J. A. Clouse, *The Whiskey Rebellion: Southwestern Pennsylvania's Frontier People Test the American Constitution* (1794; Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1994).
81. See White, *The Middle Ground*; also R. Drinnon, *Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian-Hating and Empire-Building* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1980).
82. Baily, *Journal of a Tour in Unsettled Parts*, pp. 131.
83. *Ibid.*, pp. 131–2.
84. *Pittsburgh Gazette*, 14 May 1796; 20 June 1798; 16 October 1801. Baily, *Journal of a Tour in Unsettled Parts* pp. 134, 151. Conner also summarizes some of these in *Pittsburgh in Stages*, pp. 4–6. Such venues permeated the trans-Appalachian West and will be treated at greater length in the next chapter. The best primary sources for this are S. Smith, *The Theatrical Apprenticeship and Anecdotal Recollections of Sol Smith ...* (Philadelphia, PA: Carey and Hart, 1846); and S. Smith, *Theatrical Management in the West and South for Thirty Years ...* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1868).
85. *Pittsburgh Gazette*, 17 April 1790.
86. *Pittsburgh Gazette*, 27 February 1796.
87. H. Nathans, *Early American Theatre from the Revolution to Thomas Jefferson: Into the Hands of the People* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 84, 202, n. 56.
88. R. N. Hale, 'The Pennsylvania Population Company', *Pennsylvania History* 16 (April 1949), pp. 122–30, on p. 123.
89. B. A. Chernow, 'Robert Morris, Land Speculator' (PhD dissertation, Columbia University, 1974), p. 93.
90. Hale, 'The Pennsylvania Population Company', p. 125; Chernow, 'Robert Morris, Land Speculator', p. 94. Here there is a discrepancy in the secondary literature. Hale states that Nicholson was impeached. Chernow says that while Nicholson was acquitted at his impeachment trial, he resigned. Hale's statement is confusing because he cites E.

- Hogan's, *The Impeachment, Trial and Acquittal of Francis Hopkinson and John Nicholson* (Philadelphia, PA: n.p., 1796), pp. 68–70, which seems to explicitly argue that he was acquitted, yet Hale does not qualify his statement that Nicholson was impeached. The latter may be the primary source, but it is unavailable to me at this time.
91. Hale, 'The Pennsylvania Population Company', pp. 124–6.
 92. Heather Nathans has connected the dots between PPC investors and Philadelphia theatre; I have not yet had a chance to peruse the Library Company or the Pittsburgh archive for the same connection with the 'New Theater over the Allegheny', but the circumstantial evidence is pretty strong for a connection.
 93. *Pittsburgh Gazette*, 20 February 1796.
 94. *Pittsburgh Gazette*, 27 February 1796.
 95. Moody (ed.), *Dramas from the American Theatre*, p. 100; all misspellings, colloquialisms, and diminutives in the original.
 96. Dunlap, *History*, vol. 1, pp. 130–1.
 97. Ibid.
 98. Nathans, *Early American Theater*, pp. 83–4; Strand, 'The Theater and the Republic'.
 99. Elkins and McKittrick, *The Age of Federalism*.
 100. Nathans, *Early American Theater*, p. 107.
 101. An excellent study of this is R. White's, *The Roots of Dependency: Subsistence, Environment, and Social Change among the Choctaws, Pawnees, and Navajos* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1983).
 102. S. Wilentz, *Chants Democratic: New York City and The Rise of the American Working Class, 1788–1850* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984); E. P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (New York: Pantheon, 1963); for a discussion of how that relates to working classes audiences attending American theatre in the Federalist period, see Nathans, *Early American Theater*, pp. 91–122.

4 Circus, Theatre and the Frontier

1. *Columbian Centinel*, 25 July 1795.
2. M. Murray, *Circus! From Rome to Ringling* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1956), pp. 31–2.
3. Ibid., pp. 31–2.
4. I. J. Greenwood, *The Circus: Its Origin and Growth Prior to 1835* (New York: The Dunlap Society, 1898) pp. 13–19; G. L. Chindahl, *The History of the Circus in America* (Caldwell, ID: Caxton Printers, Ltd, 1959), p. 6; R. W. G. Vail, *Random Notes on the History of the Early American Circus* (Barre, MA: Barre Gazette, 1956), pp. 74–5.
5. Vail, *Random Notes*, p. 7. There is an old fiddle tune, a hornpipe or English country dance, called 'Astley's Ride' named for this phenomenon. A similar version called 'Leslie's Ride' is one of three tunes in the Irish Set Dance figure 'The Three Tunes'. Both, and indeed the family of tunes associated with them, are alive and well in the traditional repertoire.
6. The category of gender is not included here because work in that realm has been seminal in expanding scholarly inquiry into critical imperial history. See especially, Hall, *Cultures of Empire*; Wilson (ed.), *A New Imperial History* and Stoler, *Haunted by Empire*.
7. For Astley's career, see E. C. May, *The Circus from Rome to Ringling* (1932; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1963), pp. 7–14; Murray, *Circus!*, pp. 79–88; A. H. Saxon, *Enter Foot and Horse: A History of Hippodrama in England and France* (New Haven, CT

- and London: Yale University Press, 1968). For Charles Hughes, see Saxon, *Enter Foot and Horse*, pp. 10–12.
8. Greenwood, *The Circus*, pp. 67–8.
 9. Dunlap, *History* vol. 1, pp. 267; Murray, *Circus!*, pp. 119–20.
 10. J. Durang, *The Memoir of John Durang, American Actor, 1785–1816*, ed. A. S. Downer (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press for the Historical Society of York County, 1966), pp. 42–101; R. D. James, *Cradle of Culture: The Philadelphia Stage, 1800–1810* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1957); Vail, *Random Notes*, pp. 76–80; Chindahl, *The History of the Circus*, pp. 7–10; Greenwood, *The Circus*, pp. 63–5, 71, 75. Another version of the ‘Tailor’s Ride’ story was a satire on a fictional company of tailors during the Seven Years War, none of whom could ride a horse properly; see Greenwood, *The Circus*, pp. 49–50.
 11. Recounted in Vail, *Random Notes*, pp. 76–7.
 12. *The Memoir of John Durang*, p. 46.
 13. The young actor and future manager of the Federal Theatre in Boston, William Wood, met Morris in the prison. Both men were isolated from the general population by a sympathetic jailer who was also the pit doorman at the Chestnut Street Theatre; see W. B. Wood, *Personal Recollections of the Stage* (Philadelphia, PA: Henry Carey Baird, 1855), pp. 38–9.
 14. Greenwood, *The Circus*, pp. 85–6. Greenwood goes on to note that Mr Robertson ‘eventually died in the South, having dislocated his neck, as might have been expected’, p. 87.
 15. Greenwood, *The Circus*, pp. 32
 16. *Ibid.*
 17. Vail, *Random Notes*, p. 6. Vail’s short work is a useful calendar of various and sundry menageries, equestrian performances, freaks, and acrobats in the colonial and early republic period. Not surprisingly, Dunlap says nothing of the camels in his *History of the American Theatre*.
 18. Dunlap, *History*, vol. 1, p. 352; May, *The Circus from Rome to Ringling*, p. 25.
 19. Quoted in W. T. Hill, Jr, *The Theatre in Early Kentucky, 1790–1820* (Lexington, KT: University Press of Kentucky, 1971), pp. 4–5.
 20. Hill, Jr, *Theatre in Early Kentucky*, pp. 6–8.
 21. Quoted in H. P. Phelps, *Players of a Century: A Record of the Albany Stage* (New York: Edgar S. Werner, 1890), pp. 23–4. While little is known of Allen and his wife other than their employment in the Old American Company, they were the parents of ‘the since eccentrically distinguished Andrew Jackson Allen’, a well-known actor of the nineteenth century; see J. Ireland, *Records of the New York Stage*, 2 vols (New York: Burt Franklin, 1968), vol. 1, p. 66.
 22. Phelps, *Players*, pp. 26–9. Note that the argument in support of the theatre was the same one that would be used in Boston, emphasizing the audience’s rights to attend the theatre rather than the players’ right to mount the stage. See Strand, ‘The Theater and the Republic’, p. 21.
 23. Phelps, *Players*, p. 30.
 24. See J. S. Moy, ‘The First Circus in Eastern Canada’, *Theatre Research in Canada* 1:1 (Spring 1980), pp. 12–23. For a broader view, see J. S. Moy, ‘John B. Ricketts’s Circus, 1793–1800’ (PhD dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana, 1977).
 25. *The Memoir of John Durang*, p. 4.
 26. *Ibid.*, pp. 5–6.
 27. *Ibid.*, p. 8; spellings in original.

28. Ibid., pp. 6–17.
29. Ibid., pp. 42–3.
30. Ibid., pp. 49–50.
31. Ibid., p. 50.
32. Ibid. p. 54.
33. Ibid.
34. Ibid, p. 66.
35. Ibid. A 'regimental bed' is where everyone beds down on the floor.
36. H. Neatby, *Quebec: The Revolutionary Age, 1760–1791* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1966), p. 230.
37. *The Memoir of John Durang*, pp. 67–9. For a concise summation of the entertainments offered at Ricketts's circus, see J. S. Moy, 'Entertainments at John B. Ricketts's Circus, 1793–1800', *Educational Theatre Journal*, 30:2 (May 1978), pp. 186–202. For a more thorough treatment of Ricketts's performances in Montreal and Quebec City, see Moy, 'First Circus'. Moy makes extensive use of the only other known sources of this journey, the *Montreal Gazette* and the *Quebec Gazette*.
38. *The Memoir of John Durang*, pp. 69–70. At this point, Caughnawaga was a multi-ethnic community populated by what some referred to as the 'Seven Nations of Canada', groups of Indians that had congregated missions along the St Lawrence River as refugees, essentially. These included the Oka, Odanek, Akwasasne and other groups. See C. G. Calloway (ed.), *The World Turned Upside Down: Indian Voices from Early America* (Boston, MA, and New York: Bedford/St Martin's, 1994), p. 183, n. 3.
39. *The Memoir of John Durang*, pp. 71–2. Note that the 'old chief [beat] one stick against the other' in lieu of a drum; the fact that they did not have one may be commentary on the decimated state of their culture at the time.
40. Ibid., pp. 79–80.
41. Ibid., p. 77.
42. Ibid., p. 88.
43. Ibid., p. 103.
44. Ibid., pp. 127–42.
45. The classic work on indigenous land use in North America, particularly New England, is W. Cronon, *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1983).
46. L. Hutton and B. Matthews, 'Introduction', in J. Bernard, *Retrospections of America, 1797–1811*, ed. Mrs B. Bernard (1887; Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, 1986), pp. i–vii, on p. iii.
47. Dunlap, *History*, vol. 1, p. 352.
48. Hutton and Matthews, 'Introduction', pp. iv–vi.
49. J. Bernard, *Retrospections of America, 1797–1811*, ed. Mrs B. Bernard (1887; Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, 1986), p. 236.
50. Johnson, *Absence and Memory in Colonial American Theatre*, pp. 57–61.
51. For the various schools of thought under the rubric of 'Whiggism', see Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce, and History*, pp. 215–310.
52. L. E. Klein, 'Liberty, Manners, and Politeness in Early Eighteenth-Century England', *Historical Journal*, 32:3 (1989), pp. 583–605. For the emerging public sphere, see J. Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989).

53. J. Brewer, “‘The Most Polite Age and the Most Vicious’: Attitudes towards Culture as a Commodity, 1660–1800”, in A. Bermingham and J. Brewer (eds), *The Consumption of Culture, 1600–1800: Image, Object, Text* (London: Routledge, 1995), on pp. 344–5.
54. Ibid.
55. L. C. Jones, *The Clubs of the Georgian Rakes* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942), pp. 142–54; W. Arnold, *The Life and Death of the Sublime Society of Beef Steaks* (London: Bradbury, Evans and Co., 1871).
56. Dunlap, *History*, vol. 1, p. 357. I have kept the misspellings from the original, but created a new line when the speaker changes.
57. Bernard, *Retrospections*, p. 37.
58. Ibid.
59. Ibid.
60. Ibid., pp. 38–9.
61. Ibid., p. 41.
62. Ibid., p. 42.
63. Ibid., p. 45.
64. Ibid.
65. Hutton and Matthews, ‘Introduction’, p. vi. Bernard the younger wrote for, among others, James Hackett and George Handel ‘Yankee’ Hill, actors who brought the stage Yankee to a new level of popularity during the Jacksonian era.
66. One of the best discussions of the Yankee in American consciousness is C. Rourke, *American Humor: A Study of the National Character* (1931; New York: Doubleday-Anchor, 1953), pp. 15–36. See also Morgan, *An American Icon*; F. Hodge, *Yankee Theater: The Image of America on the Stage, 1825–1850* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1964).
67. Bernard, *Retrospections*, pp. 346–7. The following account of Bernard’s tour is taken from his *Retrospections*, pp. 346–64.
68. Ibid.
69. Bernard, *Retrospections*, pp. 355–6; F. Graham, *Histrionic Montreal: Annals of the Montreal Stage with Biographical and Critical Notices of the Plays and Players of a Century* (1902; New York and London: Benjamin Blom, 1969) pp. 24, 30.
70. Bernard, *Retrospections*, pp. 354–6.
71. See the issues of the *Montreal Gazette*, the *Quebec Gazette*, and the *Canadian Courant and Montreal Advisor* from 25 February 1808 and 4 June 1810.
72. Bernard, *Retrospections*, pp. 146–7.
73. Ibid.
74. Bernard, *Retrospections*, pp. 227–8. For a somewhat dated discussion of white depictions of African Americans in the theatre of this period see, for example, H. Nathan, *Dan Emmett and the Rise of Early Negro Minstrelsy* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1962), especially Chapter 1; for a discussion of ‘Negro’ dialects on the stage, see W. J. Mahar, ‘Black English in Early Blackface Minstrelsy: A New Interpretation of the Sources of Minstrel Show Dialect’, *American Quarterly*, 37 (Summer 1985), pp. 260–85.
75. For example, theatre historian Bruce McConachie, who has done much to further the discourse of theatre history, overlooks the democratizing aspect of circus, pantomime and melodrama in this earlier period. Most conspicuously, see his ‘American Theatre in Context, from the Beginnings to 1870’, in D. B. Wilmet and C. Bigsby (eds), *The Cambridge History of American Theatre: Volume One: Beginnings to 1870* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 111–81, on pp. 129–33. I hasten to add, how-

ever, that he has been one of the few theatre historians to be astutely aware of the broader spectrum of performance culture that included the indigenous. Diana Taylor is another; see her *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003).

5 Colonizing Folk Culture

1. This is a reference to Eric Lott's Freudian analysis of minstrelsy in his book *Love and Theft: Blackface Minstrelsy and the American Working Class* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).
2. J. R. Jewitt, *A Narrative of the Adventures and Sufferings of John R. Jewitt* (1815; New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1976).
3. Ibid
4. Jewitt, *A Narrative*, p. 5.
5. Ibid., pp. 14–15.
6. Ibid., p. 34.
7. Ibid., pp. 116–17.
8. A. W. Shurcliff and S. S. Ingelfinger, *Captive of the Nootka Indians: The Northwest Coast Adventure of John R. Jewitt, 1802–1806* (Boston, MA: Back Bay Books, 1993), pp. xiv–xv.
9. Shurcliff and Ingelfinger, *Captive of the Nootka Indians*, p. 109.
10. Jewitt, *A Narrative*, p. 113.
11. Playbill for *The Armourer's Escape*, reprinted in Shurcliff and Ingelfinger, *Captive of the Nootka Indians*, pp. 209–10.
12. Ibid.
13. Shurcliff and Ingelfinger, *Captive of the Nootka Indians*, pp. 109–10.
14. 'Introduction', in M. Hays and A. Nikolopoulou (eds), *Melodrama: The Cultural Emergence of a Genre* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1996), pp. vii–xv, on p. viii.
15. H. M. Brackenbridge, *Recollections of the Persons and Places in the West* (Philadelphia, PA: James Kay, Jr, and Bros., 1834), p. iii.
16. For 'white empire republic', see A. Saxton, *The Rise and Fall of the White Republic: Class Politics and Mass Culture in Nineteenth Century America* (London: Verso, 1990); for a succinct discussion of American theatre in the Romantic Era, see D. B. Wilmet and C. Bigsby (eds), *The Cambridge History of American Theatre*, 3 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998) vol.1.
17. Letter from Thomas Forsyth to William Clark, 23 December 1812, *Thomas Forsyth Papers*, Box 4–1, Missouri Historical Society, St Louis, MO. For a recent study of this period, see C. G. Calloway, *The Shawnees and the War for America* (New York: Viking, 2007).
18. Smith, *Theatrical Management*, pp. 140–1
19. Ibid
20. Ibid., pp. 40–1.
21. Brackenridge, *Recollections of the Persons and Places*, p. 32.
22. *Chillicothe Weekly Recorder*, 2 August 1815, quoted in Murray, *Circus!*, p. 127.
23. Ibid., pp. 127–8.
24. May, *The Circus from Rome to Ringling*, p. 27; Murray, *Circus!*, pp. 126–7, 129.
25. Ibid
26. Smith, *Theatrical Management*, pp. 27–8.

27. 'Clippings' folder, Box 6, Noah Miller Ludlow Collection, Harvard Theatre Collection, Houghton Library, Harvard University.
28. Playbill, Inverness Theatre, available online at http://www.ambaile.org.uk/en/item/item_page.jsp?item_id=16002 [accessed 20 March 2010].
29. M. G. Lewis, *The Castle Spectre* (London: J.Bell, 1798), p. iii.
30. For a discussion of this use of 'practical republicanism', see J. L. Larson, *Internal Improvement: National Public Works and the Promise of Popular Government* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2001).
31. Smith, *The Theatrical Apprenticeship*, p. 41.
32. Lewis, *The Castle Spectre*, p. 25.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 46.
35. *Ibid.*, pp. 67–9.
36. *Ibid.*, pp. 69–70.
37. Smith, *The Theatrical Apprenticeship*, p. 38.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 79. There was also a variation by Thomas Sheridan, which Dunlap notes in his version.
39. W. Dunlap, *Pizarro in Peru; or, The Death of Rolla. A Play, in Five Acts. From the German of Augustus Von Kotzebue. With Notes Marking the Variations from the Original* (New York: G. F. Hopkins, 1800), p. 12.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 13.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 64.
42. 'Treaty with the Creeks', in *Indian Affairs: Laws and Treaties*, ed. C. J. Kappler (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1904), pp. 263–8.
43. Smith, *The Theatrical Apprenticeship*, p. 79.
44. *Ibid.*
45. M. E. Young, *Redskins, Ruffleshirts, and Rednecks: Indian Allotments in Alabama and Mississippi, 1830–1860* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1961), pp. 73–5; see also J. Martin, *Sacred Revolt: The Muskogee Struggle for a New World* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1991).
46. I quote this succinctly-worded passage from historian Mary Elizabeth Young because it was ahead of its time. Her dedication of the book to Paul Wallace Gates, her mentor at Cornell, who was also on the cutting edge of revising the Whig historical narrative in regard to Indian land policies supports this contention. See her *Redskins, Ruffleshirts, and Rednecks*, p. 75.
47. J. Doddridge, *Logan, the Last of the Race of Shikellemus, Chief of the Cayuaga Nation. A Dramatic Piece, to Which is Added the Dialogue of the Backwoodsman and the Dandy, First Recited at the Buffalo Seminary, July 1st, 1821* (1823; Parsons, WV: McClain Printers, 1971).
48. Letter: Smith to Ludlow, 9 June 1839, Box 1, Solomon Franklin Smith Papers, Missouri Historical Society (St Louis, MO).
49. J. A. Stone, *Metamora, Last of the Wampanoags*, in D. B. Wilmeth (ed.), *Staging the Nation: Plays from the American Theater, 1787–1909* (Boston, MA: Bedford Books, 1998), pp. 59–98, on p. 63.
50. *Ibid.*
51. *Ibid.*, p. 64 *The Commonwealth of Oceana* is the title of a political tract by James Harrington that had a significant influence on the rise of Whig ideology in post-Civil War England. Also, 'Oceana' can be seen as subtly calling to mind the crossing of the ocean by

- the self-perceived 'civilizing' forces of democracy and Christianity, a fundamental of the Whig historical narrative.
52. Stone, *Metamora*, p. 66.
 53. Ibid
 54. Ibid
 55. N. M. Ludlow, *Dramatic Life as I Found It* (1880; New York: Benjamin Bloom, 1966), p. 339.
 56. Ibid., pp. 331–3.
 57. Ibid., p. 337. Ludlow's memoir is confusing on the time frame here having been written decades after the fact; it should be used with caution. J. Oxenford and S. Brooks, *Timour The Tartar! Or, The Iron Master of Samarkand-By-Oxus. An Extravaganza* (London: Thomas Hailes Lacy, 1850).
 58. W. Barrymore, *El Hyder; the Chief of the Ghaut Mountains. A Grand Eastern Melo-Dramatic Spectacle* (London: Thomas Hailes Lacy, 1852). The stable URL for this work and its first performance date is: http://gateway.proquest.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&cxri:pql:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion-us&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:dr:Z000056014:0.
 59. Barrymore, *El Hyder*, p. 25.
 60. *The Old Mobile Project NewsLetter*, 17 (Autumn 1998) (Centre for Archaeological Studies, University of South Alabama).
 61. J. Higginbotham, *Old Mobile: Fort Louis de la Louisiane, 1702–1711* (Mobile, AL: Museum of the City of Mobile, 1977), pp. 106–7.
 62. Ludlow, *Dramatic Life*, pp. 340–3. For a variation of the Ludlow/Brown story that focuses on the buildings themselves, see M. Casto, *Actors, Audiences, and Historic Theaters of Kentucky* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2000), p. 39.
 63. Letter: Smith to Ludlow, 16 January 1839; and another, no date but believed to be written in 1839, Box 1, Solomon Franklin Smith Papers, Missouri Historical Society (St Louis, MO).
 64. Smith, *The Theatrical Apprenticeship*, p. 65. Smith says nothing of Rice's performing these songs, however. He was apparently still working on the Jim Crow act.
 65. Ludlow, *Dramatic Life*, p. 332.
 66. For a brief study of Old Corn Meal, a locally celebrated street performer in New Orleans, see H. Kmen, 'Old Corn Meal: A Forgotten Urban Negro Folksinger', *Journal of American Folklore*, 75:275 (January–March 1962), pp. 29–34.
 67. Ludlow, *Dramatic Life*, p. 36; *Louisville Public Advertiser*, 22 May 1830.
 68. W. T. Lhamon Jr, 'Introduction', in *Jump Jim Crow: Lost Plays, Lyrics and Street Prose of the First Atlantic Popular Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), pp. 1–93.
 69. 'Clipping', Thomas D. Rice Clippings Folder, Harvard Theatre Collection, Houghton Library, Cambridge, MA.
 70. Lhamon Jr, 'Introduction', pp. 10–11.
 71. Ibid, p. 96.
 72. Ibid.
 73. There is a brief summary of Jacob Hays in *New York Times*, 10 January 1892. See also A. Costello, *Our Police Protectors: A History of the New York City Police Force* (New York: NYC Police Pension Fund, 1885), chapter. 4, pt 3. Available online at: <http://www.usgennet.org/usa/ny/state/police/ch4pt3.html>.
 74. Lhamon, *Jump Jim Crow*, p. 98.

75. Ibid., pp. 98–9.
76. Ibid., p. 103. The ellipses represent where Rice would have sang the ‘wheel about an turn about’ chorus.
77. *North Star*, 27 October 1848.
78. C. Wittke, ‘Preface’, in *Tambo and Bones: A History of the American Minstrel Stage* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1930), p. vii. To avoid construing Wittke as a white supremacist, I would add that as a young man he performed as a troubadour and took an abiding interest in the rights of African Americans and women.

6 Evening Star Medicine meets Uncle Tom

1. Weltfish, *The Lost Universe*, pp. 79–80.
2. Ibid., pp. 276–7.
3. Ibid., pp. 82–3.
4. Ibid., p. 272.
5. D. R. Parks and W. R. Wedel, ‘Pawnee Geography: Historical and Sacred’, *Great Plains Quarterly*, 5 (Summer 1985), pp. 143–76, on p. 144; see also R. F. Benedict, ‘The Vision in Plains Culture’, *American Anthropologist*, 24:1 (1922), pp. 1–23, on p. 16.
6. ‘Loess’ is windblown dust deposited since the Pleistocene Era. Many of the hills and bluffs in this part of North America are made up of this material.
7. These locations and numerous others are discussed further in Parks and Wedel, ‘Pawnee Geography’, pp. 153–65.
8. Weltfish, *The Lost Universe*, p. 272.
9. Ibid., pp. 272–3. This entire recount is drawn from *ibid.*, pp. 272–317.
10. Ibid., pp. 283–4.
11. Weltfish, *The Lost Universe*, p. 284; Parks and Wedel, ‘Pawnee Geography’, p. 165.
12. Weltfish, *The Lost Universe*, p. 287. Without an experience of this event, it difficult to know what to make of it. I include it here just to underscore the sometimes profound differences between indigenous performances and their departure from cultural patterns Euro-American and, for that matter, modern readers might be accustomed to.
13. Weltfish, *The Lost Universe*, pp. 288–9.
14. Ibid., p. 296.
15. Ibid., pp. 303–4.
16. Ibid., p. 307.
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid., p. 395.
19. *Boonville Observer*, 24 June 1845, cited in E. R. Bowen, *Theatrical Entertainments in Rural Missouri before the Civil War*, University of Missouri Studies, vol. 32 (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1959), p. 20.
20. Bowen, *Theatrical Entertainments*, p. 21.
21. Ibid; *Circus in America* website, sponsored by the Institute for Advanced Technology in the Humanities, University of Virginia, 2004, http://www.circusinamerica.org/public/people/public_show/71.
22. *Weekly Missouri Statesman*, 16 May 1856.
23. *Weekly Brunswick*, 28 July 1855, quoted in E. R. Bowen, ‘A Study of Theatrical Entertainments in Rural Missouri before the Civil War’ (PhD dissertation, University of Missouri, 1950), p. 140.

24. Ibid.
25. W. O. Hubbell Diary entry, 8 February 1859, *Willard Orvis Hubbell Collection*, #394, Box 1, Folder 1, Kansas State Historical Society (Topeka, KS). Specifically, Hubbell mentions attending a 'nigger show' at the local Mason's Lodge in passing, as if it were a common occurrence. I have been unable to obtain access to the local Mason's archives in Lawrence, Kansas.
26. The classic description of the process that took the region from 'Indian Territory' to the state of Kansas is P. W. Gates, *Fifty Million Acres: Conflicts over Kansas Land Policy, 1854–1890* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1954).
27. A useful history of Fort Leavenworth can be found in J. W. Partin (ed.), *A Brief History of Fort Leavenworth, 1827–1883* (Fort Leavenworth, TX: US Army Combined Arms Centre, 1983).
28. *KWH*, 11 May 1855.
29. *KWH*, 22 March 1856.
30. *KWH*, 26 July 1856.
31. *KWH*, 30 August 1856.
32. For the US policies that impacted these indigenous peoples during this period, see H. C. Miner and W. E. Unrau, *The End of Indian Kansas: A Study of Cultural Revolution, 1851–1871* (1978; Lawrence, KS: Regents Press of Kansas, 1990); and Gates, *Fifty Million Acres*, pp. 11–47.
33. W. Unrau, *The Rise and Fall of Indian Territory, 1834–1873* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2007).
34. Unrau, *The Rise and Fall*, pp. 80–96.
35. *KWH*, 1 November 1856.
36. Bowen, *Theatrical Entertainments*, vol. 32, p. 54.
37. *KWH*, 29 November 1856.
38. *KWH*, 4 December 1856.
39. *KWH*, 20 June, 1 August, 5 September 1857.
40. *KWH*, 17, 24 October 1857.
41. Numerous studies of 'Bleeding Kansas' exist, the most recent is N. Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas: Contested Liberty in the Civil War Era* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2004). For the usurpation of 'Indian Territory' by the expanding empire during this period see Unrau and Miner, *End of Indian Kansas* and Gates, *Fifty Million Acres*, as well as Unrau, *The Rise and Fall of Indian Country*.
42. *LDT*, 4 April 1862.
43. The development of this division is the subject of L. Levin, *Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988).
44. *KWH*, 20 March 1858.
45. 'An Original Comic Song, written by Saxton, entitled *The Kansas War and Other Matters*, as sung at Smith's Theatre, by J. H. Thompson, in the costume of a Returned Soldier, Tune – "Good Old Days of Adam and Eve"', Box 1–4, 'Music Collection', Missouri Historical Society (St Louis, MO).
46. *KWH*, 27 March 1858.
47. W. H. Smith, *The Drunkard: or, the Fallen Saved! A Moral Domestic Drama* (Boston, MA: Jones Publishing House, 1847), pp. 1–50.
48. For a discussion of the alcohol consumption in the nineteenth century, see W. J. Rorabaugh, *The Alcoholic Republic: An American Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press,

- 1979). See also J. D. Mason, *Melodrama and the Myth of America* (Bloomington, IN, and Indianapolis: University of Indiana Press, 1993), pp. 61–88.
49. *KWH*, 24 April 1858.
 50. *KWH*, 2 February 1858.
 51. 'State Rights' is often synonymous with pro-slavery during this period.
 52. *KWH*, 24 April, 18 May 1858. Both theatres were advertising and competing for an audience in the spring of 1858. Individual professional players in almost every case would have come to Leavenworth during a break in their tour with the Smith and Ludlow troupe headquartered in St Louis or a travelling minstrel show. See Smith, *Theatrical Management*, and Ludlow, *Dramatic Life*.
 53. *KWH*, 27 March, 1858.
 54. *KWH*, 29 May 1858.
 55. *Leavenworth Weekly Journal*, 15 July 1858.
 56. *KWH*, 17, 24 July 1858.
 57. *KWH*, 16, 23 October 1858.
 58. *KWH*, 13 November 1858.
 59. Lincoln arrived in Leavenworth on 3 December 1859 and stayed for three days, during which time he gave an early campaign speech at the Hall. See C. D. Ayres, *Lincoln and Kansas: Partnership for Freedom* (Manhattan, KS: Sunflower University Press, 2001); *A Guide to Leavenworth, Kansas*, American Guide Series, Works Progress Administration, Kansas Writers' Project (Leavenworth: *Leavenworth Chronicle*, 1940); J. H. Johnston, III (ed.), *Early Leavenworth and Fort Leavenworth: A Photographic History* (Leavenworth, KS: J. H. Johnston, III, 1977), p. 28; on that page is a photo of the old Stockton Hall.
 60. *LDT*, 19–22 April 1859.
 61. *LDT*, 23, 26–8 April 1859; for the Mestayers at Stockton Hall, see *LDT*, 4 May 1859.
 62. *LDT*, 27 May 1859.
 63. An interesting study of the environmental impact of this encounter is E. West, *The Contested Plains: Indians, Goldseekers, and the Rush to Colorado* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1998).
 64. *LDT*, 26–8 October 1859
 65. *LDT*, 26–8 October 1859; also recounted by J. Malin in 'Theater in Kansas, 1858–1868: Background for the Coming of the Lord Dramatic Company to Kansas, 1869', *Kansas Historical Quarterly*, 23:1 (Spring 1957), pp. 10–53, on pp. 47–8.
 66. *Leavenworth Daily Conservative*, 6–9 August 1862.
 67. T. F. Gossett, *Uncle Tom's Cabin and American Literature* (Dallas, TX: Southern Methodist University Press, 1985), pp. 274, 276, 280.
 68. *Leavenworth Daily Conservative*, 28–30 April, 2 May 1863; Malin, 'Theater in Kansas', pp. 48–9.
 69. Gossett, *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, p. 267.
 70. *Leavenworth Daily Conservative*, 18 September 1861.
 71. Grimes, *Beginnings in Ritual Studies*, p. 150.

Conclusion

1. J. Neihardt, *Poetic Values: Their Reality and Our Need of Them* (New York: MacMillan, 1925), p. 14.
2. R. Jacobsen, 'Sssh', in R. Bly (ed.), *The Soul Is Here for Its Own Joy* (Hopewell, NJ: Ecco, 1995), p. 250.

WORKS CITED

Primary Sources

Newspapers

Boonville Observer.
Canadian Courant and Montreal Advisor.
Chillicothe Weekly Recorder.
Columbian Centinel.
Kansas Weekly Herald.
Leavenworth Daily Conservative.
Leavenworth Daily Tribune.
Leavenworth Weekly Journal.
Louisville Public Advertiser.
Montreal Gazette.
New England Chronicle; or, the Essex Gazette.
New York Times.
North Star.
Pittsburgh Gazette.
Quebec Gazette.
Weekly Brunswick.
Weekly Missouri Statesman.

Published Primary Sources

Alder, J., *The Captivity of Jonathan Alder and His Life with the Indians*, transcribed by H. Alder, ed. O. E. Brown (Alliance, OH: Orley Brown, 1965), pp. 46–7
Am Baile Online Archive. http://www.ambaile.org.uk/en/item/item_page.jsp?item_id=16002 [accessed 20 March 2010].

- André, J., 'Particulars of the Mischianza in America,' *Gentleman's Magazine*, 48 (1778), pp. 355–6.
- Asser, *The Life of King Alfred, from A.D. 849–887*, available online at the Online Medieval and Classical Library, <http://omacl.org/KingAlfred/part1.html> [accessed 14 March 2010]
- Baily, F., *Journal of a Tour in Unsettled Parts of North America in 1796 and 1797*. London: Baily Brothers, 1856.
- Barrymore, W., *El Hyder; the Chief of the Ghaut Mountains. A Grand Eastern Melo-Dramatic Spectacle* (London: Thomas Hailes Lacy, 1852).
- Bartram, W., *Travels through North and South Carolina, Georgia, East and West Florida ... Together with Observations on the Manner of the Indians* (Philadelphia, PA: James and Johnson, 1791).
- Bernard, J., *Retrospections of America, 1797–1811*, ed. Mrs B. Bernard. (1887; Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, 1986).
- Brackenridge, H. M., *Recollections of the Persons and Places in the West* (Philadelphia, PA: James Kay, Jr., and Bros., 1834).
- Brackenridge, H. H., and P. Freneau., *A Poem on the Rising Glory of America: Being an Exercise Delivered at the Public Commencement at Nassau-Hall, September 25, 1771* (Philadelphia, PA: J. Cruikshank, 1772). Readex Microprint Series. *Three Centuries of Drama: American, 1714–1830*.
- Charlevoix, P., *Journal of a Voyage to North America*, 2 vols (London: R. & J. Dodsley, 1761).
- Clapp, Jr., W. W., *A Record of the Boston Stage* (Boston and Cambridge, MA: James Munroe and Company, 1853).
- Coleman, G., *Incle and Yarico: An Opera, printed from the acting copy, with remarks, biographical and critical, by D—G* (London: John Cumberland, n.d.), reprinted in E. Inchbald (ed.), *British Theater; or A Collection of Plays which are Acted at Theatres Royal, Drury Lane, Covent Garden, and Haymarket*, 25 vols (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, 1808), vol. 2, pp. 640–57.
- Correspondence and proclamation relating to Treaty of Easton 1758, http://www.heritage.nf.ca/law/lab6/labvol6_3087.html [accessed 2 March 2010].
- Doddridge, J., *Logan, the Last of the Race of Shikellemus, Chief of the Cayuaga Nation. A Dramatic Piece, to Which is Added the Dialogue of the Backwoodsman and the Dandy, First Recited at the Buffalo Seminary, July 1st, 1821* (1823; Parsons, WV: McClain Printers, 1971).
- Durang, J., *The Memoir of John Durang, American Actor, 1785–1816*, ed. A S. Downer (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press for the Historical Society of York County, 1966).
- Dunlap, W., *Pizarro in Peru; or, The Death of Rolla. A Play, in Five Acts. From the German of Augustus Von Kotzebue. With Notes Marking the Variations from the Original* (New York: G. F. Hopkins, 1800).
- , *History of the American Theatre*, 2 vols (1832; New York: Burt Franklin, 1963).
- Ewing, G., *The Military Journal of George Ewing*. <http://www.sandcastles.net/george.htm> [accessed 14 March 2010].

- Fanon, F., *Black Skin, White Masks* (1952; New York: Grove Press, 1967).
- Franks, B., 'Letters of Becky Franks', *Magazine of History and Biography*, 16(1892), pp. 216–18.
- Gilman, A. (ed.), *Theatrum Majorum ... with Which is Incorporated Extracts from the Diary of Dorothy Dudley* (Cambridge: Lockwood, Brooks and Company, 1876).
- A Guide to Leavenworth, Kansas*, American Guide Series. Works Progress Administration. Kansas Writers' Project. (Leavenworth, 1940).
- Hamilton, E. P. (trans. and ed.), *Adventure in the Wilderness: The American Journals of Louis Antoine de Bougainville, 1756–1760* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1964).
- Hamilton, H., *The Journal of Henry Hamilton*, in J. D. Barnhart (ed.), *Henry Hamilton and George Rogers Clark in the American Revolution* (Crawfordville, IN: R. E. Banta, 1951), pp. 7–244.
- Hatton, A. J., *The Songs of Tammany, or, The Indian Chief: A Serious Opera* (New York: Harisson and Faulkner, 1794), Early American Imprint Series, Evans 27100, pp. 1–7.
- Heart, J., *Journal of Captain Jonathan Heart*, ed. W. Butterfield (Albany, NY: Joel Munsells Sons, 1885).
- Henry, A., *Travels and Adventures in Canada and the Indian Territories between the Years 1760 and 1766* (Boston, MA: Little, Brown, and Co., 1901).
- Hill, Jr., W. T., *The Theatre in Early Kentucky, 1790–1820* (Lexington, KT: University Press of Kentucky, 1971).
- Hogan, E., *The Impeachment, Trial and Acquittal of Francis Hopkinson and John Nicholson* (Philadelphia, PA: n.p., 1796).
- Hubbell, W. O., *Willard Orvis Hubbell Collection*, Kansas State Historical Society (Topeka, KS), online at <http://www.territorialkansasonline.org/~imlskto/cgi-bin/index.php> [accessed 20 March 2010].
- Inchbald, E. (ed.), *British Theater; or A Collection of Plays which are Acted at Theatres Royal, Drury Lane, Covent Garden, and Haymarket*, 25 vols (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, 1808).
- Indian Affairs: Laws and Treaties*, ed. C. J. Kappler (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1904).
- Indian Treaties*. <http://earlytreaties.unl.edu>. [accessed 19 March 2010].
- Instructions Given Mr. Christopher Gist by the Committee of the Ohio Company the 11th Day of September 1750*, in W. M. Darlington (ed.), *Christopher Gist's Journals* (Pittsburgh, PA: J. R. Weldin & Co., 1893), pp. 31–2.
- Ireland, J., *Records of the New York Stage*, 2 vols (New York: Burt Franklin, 1968)
- Jacobsen, R., 'Sssh', in R. Bly (ed.), *The Soul Is Here for Its Own Joy* (Hopewell, NJ: Ecco, 1995), p.250
- Jewitt, J. R., *A Narrative of the Adventures and Sufferings of John R. Jewitt* (1815; New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1976).

- Johnson, W. *The Papers of Sir William Johnson*, ed. A. C. Flick, 14 vols (Albany, NY: State University of New York, 1921–65).
- Kenny, J., 'Journal of James Kenny, 1761–63' in *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 37:2 (1913), pp. 152–201.
- 'Letter, Lords of Trade to Albany Commissioners, 18 September 1753; read at the opening session of the Albany Congress, 19 June 1754' New York Papers, Bundle Kk., No. 20
- Lewis, M. G., *The Castle Spectre* (London: J. Bell, 1798).
- Ludlow, N. M., *Noah Miller Ludlow Papers*, Harvard Theatre Collection (Boston, MA).
- , *Dramatic Life as I Found It* (1880; New York: Benjamin Bloom, 1966).
- McCullough, J., *A Narrative of the Captivity of John McCullough, Esq.*, in A. Loudon (ed.), *A Selection of Narratives of Outrages Committed by the Indians in Their Wars with the White People*, 111 vols (Carlisle, PA: A. Loudon, 1808). Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, vol. 29 (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1977).
- A Memorial containing a Summary of Facts with their Authorities in Answer to the Observations Sent by the English Ministry to the Courts of Europe*, translator unknown (London: J. Parker and W. Weyman, 1757).
- Music Collection*, Missouri Historical Society (St Louis, MO)
- New York State, *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York*. Albany, NY: Weed, Parsons, and Co., 1857.
- Oxenford, J., and S. Brooks, *Timour The Tartar! Or, The Iron Master of Samarkand-By-Oxus. An Extravaganza* (London: Thomas Hailes Lacy, 1850).
- The Paxton Boys; A Farce*. Translated from the original French by 'A Native of Dingall' (Philadelphia, PA: Anthony Armbruster, 1764). Readex Microprint Series. *Three Centuries of Drama: America, 1714–1830*.
- Plutarch, 'The Life of Cato the Elder', in Plutarch, *The Parallel Lives* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), pp. 303–85.
- Schoepf, J. D., *Travels in the Confederation, 1783–1784, from the German of Johann David Schoepf* ed. J. Morrison (1788; New York: Morrow, 1968).
- Solomon Franklin Smith Papers*, Missouri Historical Society (St Louis, MO).
- Smith, S., *The Theatrical Apprenticeship and Anecdotal Recollections of Sol Smith ...* (Philadelphia, PA: Carey and Hart, 1846).
- , *Theatrical Management in the West and South for Thirty Years ...* (1868; New York: Benjamin Blom, 1963).
- Smith, W. H., *The Drunkard: or, the Fallen Saved! A Moral Domestic Drama* (Boston, MA: Jones Publishing House, 1847).
- Steele, R., 'Inkle and Yarico', in *Spectator*, 13 March 1711.
- Stone, J. A. *Metamora, Last of the Wampanoags*, in D. B. Wilmet (ed.), *Staging the Nation: Plays from the American Theater, 1787–1909* (Boston, MA: Bedford Books, 1998), pp. 59–98.

- 'Treaty of Lancaster, 1744', reproduced in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 13:2 (October 1905), pp. 141–2
- 'Treaty of Logg's Town', reproduced in *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 13:2 (October 1905), p. 59–98.
- Trent, W., *Journal of Captain William Trent from Logstown to Pickawillany, A.D. 1752* (1871; New York: Arno Press, 1971).
- Wood, W. B., *Personal Recollections of the Stage* (Philadelphia, PA: Henry Carey Baird, 1855).

Secondary Sources

- Agnew, J.-C., *Worlds Apart: The Market and the Theater in Anglo-American Thought, 1550–1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).
- Anderson, F., and A. Cayton. *The Dominion of War: Empire and Liberty in North America, 1500–2000* (New York: Viking, 2005).
- Armitage, D (ed.), *Theories of Empire, 1450–1800* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995).
- Arnold, W., *The Life and Death of the Sublime Society of Beef Steaks* (London: Bradbury, Evans, & Co., 1871).
- Ayres, C. D., *Lincoln and Kansas: Partnerships for Freedom* (Manhattan, KS: Sunflower University Press, 2001).
- Bacevich, A., *American Empire: The Realities and Consequences of U.S. Diplomacy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002).
- Bailey, K. P. *The Ohio Company of Virginia and the Westward Movement, 1748–1792: A Chapter in the History of the Colonial Frontier* (Glendale, CA: Arthur H. Clark Co., 1939).
- Bailyn, B., *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1967).
- , *Voyagers to the West: A Passage in the Peopling of America Just Prior to the Revolution* (New York: Knopf, 1986).
- Balen, M., *The Secret History of the South Sea Bubble: The World's First Great Financial Scandal* (London: Fourth Estate, 2003).
- Bass, R. D., *The Green Dragon: The Lives of Banastre Tarlton and Mary Robinson* (New York: Henry Holt, 1947).
- Benedict, R. F., 'The Vision in Plains Culture', *American Anthropologist*, 24:1 (1922), pp. 1–23.
- Berkhofer, R., *The White Man's Indian: History of an Idea from Columbus to the Present* (New York: Knopf, 1978).
- Berlin, I., *Many Thousands Gone: the First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1998).
- Bermingham, A., and J. Brewer (eds), *The Consumption of Culture, 1600–1800: Image, Object, Text* (London: Routledge, 1995).

- Blain, V., P. Clements and I. Grundy (eds), *The Feminist Companion to Literature in English: Women Writers from the Middle Ages to the Present* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990).
- Bly, R. (ed.), *The Soul Is Here for Its Own Joy* (Hopewell, NJ: Ecco, 1995).
- Bowen, E. R., *Theatrical Entertainments in Rural Missouri before the Civil War*, University of Missouri Studies (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1959).
- Boyd, S. R., *The Whiskey Rebellion: Past and Present Perspectives* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1985).
- Brewer, J., "'The Most Polite Age and the Most Vicious': Attitudes towards Culture as a Commodity, 1660–1800" in A. Bermingham and J. Brewer (eds), *The Consumption of Culture, 1600–1800: Image, Object, Text* (London: Routledge, 1995), pp. 341–61.
- Brown, J., *The Theatre in America during the Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- Buchanan, J., *The Road to Guilford Courthouse: The American Revolution in the Carolinas* (New York: Wiley, 1997).
- Burrow, J. W. *Whigs and Liberals: Continuity and Change in English Political Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988).
- Calloway, C. G., *The Shawnees and the War for America* (New York: Viking, 2007).
- (ed.), *The World Turned Upside Down: Indian Voices from Early America* (Boston, MA, and New York: Bedford/St Martin's, 1994).
- Campbell, J., *The Masks of God*, 4 vols (1959; New York: Penguin, 1985).
- Canary, R. H., *William Dunlap* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1970).
- Carson, R., *Silent Spring* (1962; Boston, MA and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1994).
- Carswell, J., *The South Sea Bubble* (Dover, NH: Alan Sutton, 1993).
- Casto, M., *Actors, Audiences, and Historic Theaters of Kentucky* (Lexington, KT: University Press of Kentucky, 2000).
- Cayton, A. R. L., and F. J. Teute (eds), *Contact Points: American Frontiers from the Mohawk Valley to the Mississippi, 1750–1830* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1998).
- Chartier, R., *Cultural History: Between Practices and Representations*, trans. L. G. Cochrane (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988).
- Chernow, B. A., 'Robert Morris, Land Speculator' (PhD dissertation, Columbia University, 1974).
- Child, F., *English and Scottish Ballads* (New York: Phinney, Blakeman and Mason, 1860).
- Chindahl, G. L., *The History of the Circus in America* (Caldwell, ID: Caxton Printers, Ltd, 1959).
- Circus in America* website, Institute for Advanced Technology in the Humanities, University of Virginia, 2004. Online at http://www.circusinamerica.org/public/people/public_show/71 [accessed 20 March 2010].

- Clouse, J. A., *The Whiskey Rebellion: Southwestern Pennsylvania's Frontier People Test the American Constitution* (1794; Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission 1994).
- Conner, L., *Pittsburgh in Stages* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2007).
- Costello, A., *Our Police Protectors: A History of the New York City Police Force*. New York: NYC Police Pension Fund, 1885). Online at <http://www.usgennet.org/usa/ny/state/police/ch4pt3.html> [accessed 20 March 2010].
- Cronon, W., *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1983).
- Crosby, A. W., *The Columbian Exchange: Biological and Cultural Consequences of 1492* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1972).
- Cumfer, C., *Separate Peoples, One Land: The Minds of Cherokees, Blacks, and Whites on the Tennessee Frontier* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2007).
- Curtin, N. J., *The United Irishmen: Popular Politics in Ulster and Dublin, 1791–1798* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).
- Curtis, M. J., 'The Early Charleston Theatre, 1703–1798' (PhD dissertation, University of Indiana, 1968).
- Darlington, W. M. (ed.), *Christopher Gist's Journals* (Pittsburgh, PA: J. R. Weldin & Co., 1893).
- Davis, S., *Parades and Power: Street Theater in Nineteenth-Century Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1986).
- Dickson, R. J., *Ulster Emigration to Colonial America, 1718–1775* (Belfast: Ulster Historical Foundation, 1988).
- Dippie, B. W., *The Vanishing American: White Attitudes and U.S. Indian Policy*. (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas).
- Doolen, A., *Fugitive Empire: Locating Early American Imperialism* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2005).
- Dowd, G. E., *War under Heaven: Pontiac, the Indian Nations, and the British Empire* (Baltimore, MD and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002).
- Drinnon, R., *Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian-Hating and Empire-Building*. (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1980).
- Dunaway, W. F., *The Scotch-Irish of Colonial Pennsylvania* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1944).
- Durang, C., *History of the Philadelphia Stage between the Years 1749 and 1855* (Philadelphia, PA: Philadelphia Sunday Dispatch, 1868).
- Edmunds, R. D., 'Old Briton', in Edmunds (ed.), *American Indian Leaders* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1980), pp. 1–20.
- Elkins, S., and E. McKittrick, *The Age of Federalism* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).
- Etcheson, N., *Bleeding Kansas: Contested Liberty in the Civil War Era* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2004).

- Faragher, J. M., *Daniel Boone: The Life and Legend of an American Pioneer* (New York: Henry Holt, 1992).
- Felsenstein, F. (ed.), *English Trader, Indian Maid: Representing Gender, Race, and Slavery in the New World, an Inkle and Yarico Reader* (Baltimore, MD, and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999).
- Ferguson, E. J., *The Power of the Purse: A History of American Public Finance, 1776–1790* (Charlotte, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1961).
- Ferguson, N., *Empire* (London: Allen Lane, 2002).
- Fietz, L., 'On the Origins of English Melodrama in the Tradition of Bourgeois Tragedy and Sentimental Drama: Lillo, Schröder, Kotzebue, Sheridan, Thompson, Jerrold', in M. Hays and A. Nikolopoulou (eds), *Melodrama: The Cultural Emergence of a Genre* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1996), pp. 83–102.
- Friedenberg, D. M., *Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Land: The Plunder of Early America* (Buffalo, NY: Prometheus, 1992).
- Garber, P. M., *Famous First Bubbles: The Fundamentals of Early Manias* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000).
- Gates, P. W., *Fifty Million Acres: Conflicts over Kansas Land Policy, 1854–1890* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1954).
- Gilje, P., *Rioting in America* (Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press, 1996).
- Gnadenhütten Massacre Website. <http://www.ohiohistorycentral.org/entry.php?rec=499> [accessed 14 March 2010].
- Gossett, T. F., *Uncle Tom's Cabin and American Literature* (Dallas, TX: Southern Methodist University Press, 1985).
- Graham, F., *Histrionic Montreal: Annals of the Montreal Stage with Biographical and Critical Notices of the Plays and Players of a Century* (1902; New York and London: Benjamin Blom, 1969).
- Graña, C., *Fact and Symbol: Essays in the Sociology of Art and Literature* (New York: Oxford, 1971).
- Greenwood, I. J. *The Circus: Its Origin and Growth Prior to 1835* (New York: The Dunlap Society, 1898).
- Grimes, R. L., *Beginnings in Ritual Studies* (1982; Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1995).
- Grind, Jr., D. A. and B. E. Johansen, *Exemplars of Liberty: Native America and the Evolution of Democracy* (Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Native American Studies Centre, 1991).
- Gummere, R. M., *The American Colonial Mind and the Classical Tradition: Essays in Comparative Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963).
- Habermas, J., *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989).
- Hale, H. (ed.) *The Iroquois Book of Rites* (1883; New York: AMS Press, 1969).
- Hale, R. N., 'The Pennsylvania Population Company'. *Pennsylvania History*, 16 (April 1949), pp. 122–30.

- Hall, C (ed.), *Cultures of Empire: Colonizers in Britain and the Empire in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries, A Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2000).
- Hallowell, A. I., *Culture and Experience* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955).
- , 'Ojibwa Ontology, Behavior, and Worldview', in D. Tedlock and B. Tedlock (eds), *Teachings from the American Earth: Indian Religion and Philosophy* (New York: Liveright, 1975) pp. 141–78.
- Hamilton, J. T., *All the News That's Fit to Sell: How the Market Transforms Information into News* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004)
- Harris, N., *The Artist in American Society: The Formative Years, 1790–1860* (New York: George Braziller, 1966).
- Hart, C. H., 'Mary White – Mrs. Robert Morris', *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 2:1 (1878), pp. 162–3.
- Hart, F. E., 'Performance, Phenomenology, and the Cognitive Turn', in McConachie and Hart (eds), *Performance and Cognition*, pp. 52–75.
- Hatch, R. M., *Major John André: A Gallant in Spy's Clothing* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1986).
- Hays, M. and A. Nikolopoulou (eds), *Melodrama: The Cultural Emergence of a Genre*. (New York: St Martin's Press, 1996).
- Herschel, J. F. W., 'Memoir of Francis Baily, Esq.', in *Journal of a Tour in Unsettled Parts of North America in 1796 and 1797* (London: Baily Brothers, 1856), pp. 1–60.
- Hewitt, B., *Theatre U.S.A., 1665–1957* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959).
- Higginbotham, J., *Old Mobile: Fort Louis de la Louisiane, 1702–1711* (Mobile, AL: Museum of the City of Mobile, 1977).
- Hodge, F., *Yankee Theatre: The Image of America on the Stage, 1825–1850* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1964).
- Hogeland, W., *The Whiskey Rebellion: George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, and the Frontier Rebels Who Challenged America's Newfound Sovereignty* (New York: Scribner, 2006).
- Holmes, J. D. L. (ed.), 'Introduction', in the second printing of the *Journal* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1969), pp. xvii–xxiv.
- Hoole, W. S., *The Ante-Bellum Charleston Theatre* (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama, 1946).
- Hornblow, A., *A History of the Theatre in America: From Its Beginnings to the Present Time* (1919; New York and London: Benjamin Blom, 1965).
- Hunter, C. E., 'The Delaware Nativist Revival of the Mid-Eighteenth Century', *Ethnohistory*, 18:1 (Winter 1971), pp. 39–49.
- Hutton, L. and B. Matthews, 'Introduction', in J. Bernard, *Retrospections of America, 1797–1811*, ed. Mrs B. Bernard (1887; Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, 1986), pp. i–vii.
- Ignatiev, N., *How the Irish Became White* (New York: Routledge, 1995).

- Irwin, L., *The Dream Seekers: Native American Visionary Traditions of the Great Plains* (Norman, OK, and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994).
- Jackson, J. W., *With the British Army in Philadelphia 1777–1778* (San Rafael, CA, and London: Presidio Press, 1979).
- Jackson, W., *Becoming Native to This Place, Rooted in the Land* (Lexington, KT: University Press of Kentucky, 1994).
- Jacob, M. D., and J. R. Jacob (eds), *The Origins of Anglo-American Radicalism* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1984).
- Jacobs, W. R., 'British Colonial Attitudes and Policies Toward the Indian in the American Colonies', in H. Peckham and C. Gibson (eds), *Attitudes of Colonial Powers Toward the American Indian* (Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press, 1969).
- , *Dispossessing the American Indian: Indians and Whites on the Colonial Frontier* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972).
- James, A. P., *The Ohio Company: Its Inner History* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1959).
- James, R. D., *Cradle of Culture: The Philadelphia Stage, 1800–1810* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1957).
- Jennings, F., *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest* (1975; New York: Norton, 1976).
- , *The Ambiguous Iroquois Empire: The Covenant Chain Confederation of Indian Tribes with English Colonies from Its Beginnings to the Lancaster Treaty of 1744* (New York: Norton, 1984).
- Johnson, O., *Absence and Memory: Fiorelli's Plaster* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).
- Johnson, O., and W. Burling, *The Colonial American Stage, 1665–1774: A Documentary Calendar* (Madison and Teaneck, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2001).
- Johnston, III, J. H. (ed.), *Early Leavenworth and Fort Leavenworth: A Photographic History* (Leavenworth: J. H. Johnston, III, 1977).
- Jones, D. V., *License for Empire: Colonialism by Treaty in Early America* (Chicago, IL, and London: University of Chicago Press, 1982).
- Jones, L. C., *The Clubs of the Georgian Rakes* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942).
- Jones, M., 'Sir William Howe: Conventional Strategist', in G. Billias (ed.), *George Washington's Opponents: British Generals and Admirals in the American Revolution* (New York: Morrow, 1969), pp. 39–72.
- Jordan, W., *White over Black: American Attitudes toward the Negro, 1550–1812* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1968).
- Kaplan, A. and D. E. Pease (eds) *Cultures of United States Imperialism* (Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 1993).
- Kilpatrick, A. E., "Going to the Water": A Structural Analysis of Cherokee Purification Rituals. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 15:3 (1991), pp. 49–58.

- Klein, L. E., 'Liberty, Manners, and Politeness in Early Eighteenth-Century England,' *Historical Journal*, 32:3 (1989), pp. 583–605.
- Kmen, H., 'Old Corn Meal: A Forgotten Urban Negro Folksinger,' *Journal of American Folklore*, 75 (January–March 1962), pp. 29–34.
- Kulikoff, A., *The Agrarian Origins of American Capitalism* (Charlottesville, VA, and London: University of Virginia Press, 1992).
- Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson, *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought* (New York: Basic Books, 1999).
- Larson, J. L., *Internal Improvement: National Public Works and the Promise of Popular Government* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2001).
- Leopold, A., *A Sand County Almanac; and Sketches Here and There* (1949; New York: Oxford, 1987).
- Levin, L., *Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America*. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988).
- Lhamon, Jr, W. T. *Raising Cain: Blackface Performance from Jim Crow to Hip Hop* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998).
- , *Jump Jim Crow: Lost Plays, Lyrics, and Street Prose of the First Atlantic Popular Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003).
- Lillo, G., *The London Merchant: or, the History of George Barnwell* (London, n.p., 1735), pp. v–x.
- Lott, E., *Love and Theft: Blackface Minstrelsy and the American Working Class* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).
- Mahar, W. J. 'Black English in Early Blackface Minstrelsy: A New Interpretation of the Sources of Minstrel Show Dialect,' *American Quarterly*, 37 (Summer 1985), pp. 260–85.
- Maier, C., *Among Empires: American Ascendancy and Its Predecessors* (Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press, 2006).
- Malin, J., 'Theater in Kansas, 1858–1868: Background for the Coming of the Lord Dramatic Company to Kansas, 1869,' *Kansas Historical Quarterly*, 23:1 (Spring 1957), pp. 10–53.
- Manley, H. S., *The Treaty of Fort Stanwix 1784* (Rome, NY: Rome Sentinel Company, 1932).
- Mason, J. D., *Melodrama and the Myth of America* (Bloomington, IN and Indianapolis: University of Indiana Press, 1993).
- Marsh, G. P., *Man and Nature* (New York: C. Scribner, 1864).
- Marshall, L. H., *National Myth and Imperial Fantasy* (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008).
- Marshall, P., 'Lord Hillsborough, Samuel Wharton and the Ohio Grant, 1769–1775,' *English Historical Review*, 80:317 (October 1965), pp. 717–39.
- May, E. C., *The Circus from Rome to Ringling* (1932; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1963).
- Martin, J., *Sacred Revolt: The Muskogee Struggle for a New World* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1991).

- McCluny, E. B. 'Lacrosse: Combat of the Spirits', *American Indian Quarterly*, 1:1 Spring 1974, pp. 34–42.
- McConachie, B., *Melodramatic Formations: American Theatre and Society, 1820–1870*. (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1992).
- , 'American Theatre in Context, from the Beginnings to 1870', in D. B. Wilmeth and C. Bigsby (eds), *The Cambridge History of American Theatre: Volume One: Beginnings to 1870* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 111–81.
- , 'Cognitive Studies and Epistemic Competence in Cultural History: Moving Beyond Freud and Lacan', in B. McConachie and F. E. Hart (eds), *Performance and Cognition: Theatre Studies and the Cognitive Turn* (London and New York: Routledge, 2006), pp. 52–75.
- McConachie, B., and F. E. Hart (eds), *Performance and Cognition: Theatre Studies and the Cognitive Turn* (London and New York: Routledge, 2006).
- McConnell, M. N., *A Country Between: The Upper Ohio Valley and Its Peoples, 1724–1774* (Lincoln, NE, and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1992).
- Merrell, J., *Into the American Woods: Negotiators on the Pennsylvania Frontier* (New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1999).
- , *The Indians' New World: Catawbas and Their Neighbors from European Contact through the Era of Removal* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1989).
- Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*, at <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/colonialism> [accessed 14 March 2010].
- Meserve, W., *An Emerging Entertainment: The Drama of the American People to 1828* (Bloomington, IN, and London: Indiana University Press, 1977).
- Middleton, R., *Pontiac's War: Its Causes, Course and Consequences* (New York: Routledge, 2007).
- Miner, H. C., and W. E. Unrau, *The End of Indian Kansas: A Study of Cultural Revolution, 1854–1871* (1978; Lawrence, KS: Regents Press of Kansas, 1990).
- Mirzoeff, N., *Watching Babylon: The War in Iraq and Global Visual Culture* (New York and London: Routledge, 2005).
- Moody, R (ed.), *Dramas from the American Theatre, 1762–1909* (Cleveland, OH, and New York: The World Publishing Company, 1966).
- Morgan, W., *An American Icon: Brother Jonathan and American Identity* (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 1988).
- Morrison, K. M., *Solidarity of Kin: Ethnohistory, Religious Studies, and the Algonkian-French Religious Encounter* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2002).
- Moy, J. S., 'John B. Ricketts's Circus, 1793–1800' (PhD dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana, 1977).
- , 'Entertainments at John B. Ricketts's Circus, 1793–1800', *Educational Theatre Journal*, 30:2 (May 1978), pp. 186–202.
- , 'The First Circus in Eastern Canada', *Theatre Research in Canada*, 1:1 (Spring 1980), pp. 12–23.

- Mulkearn, L. (ed.), *George Mercer Papers Relating to the Ohio Company of Virginia* (Pittsburg, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1954).
- Murray, M., *Circus! From Rome to Ringling* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1956).
- Nabokov, P., *Where the Lightning Strikes: The Lives of American Indian Sacred Places* (New York: Penguin, 2006).
- Nash, G. B., *The Urban Crucible: The Northern Seaports and the Era of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986).
- Nathan, H., *Dan Emmett and the Rise of Early Negro Minstrelsy* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1962).
- Nathans, H., *Early American Theatre from the Revolution to Thomas Jefferson: Into the Hands of the People* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- Nativeweb, http://www.nativeweb.org/pages/legal/amherst/lord_jeff.html [accessed 4 April 2010].
- Neatby, H., *Quebec: The Revolutionary Age, 1760–1791* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1966).
- Neihardt, J., *Poetic Values: Their Reality and Our Need of Them* (New York: MacMillan, 1925).
- Nichols, D. A., *Red Gentlemen and White Savages: Indians, Federalists, and the Search for Order on the American Frontier* (Charlottesville, VA, and London: University of Virginia Press, 2008).
- Norwood, J. W., *The Tammany Legend: Tamanend* (Boston, MA: Meador Publishing, 1938).
- Nugent, W., *Habits of Empire: A History of American Expansion*. (New York: Knopf, 2008).
- O'Callaghan, E. B. (ed.), *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York*, 11 vols (Albany, NY: Weed, Parsons, and Co., 1855)
- Ogasapian, J., *Music of the Colonial and Revolutionary Era* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2004).
- O'Gorman, E., *The Invention of America: An Inquiry into the Historical Nature of the New World and the Meaning of Its History* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1961).
- Old Mobile Project NewsLetter*, 17 (Autumn 1998) (Centre for Archaeological Studies, University of South Alabama).
- Onuf, P. S., *Jefferson's Empire: The Language of American Nationhood* (Charlottesville, VA, and London: University Press of Virginia, 2000).
- Parks, D. R., and W. R. Wedel, 'Pawnee Geography: Historical and Sacred', *Great Plains Quarterly*, 5 (Summer 1985), pp. 143–76.
- Partin, J. W. (ed.), *A Brief History of Fort Leavenworth, 1827–1983* (Fort Leavenworth, TX: US Army Combined Arms Centre, 1983).
- Pencak, W. (ed.), *Riot and Revelry in Early America* (University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2002)

- Perkins, J., *Confessions of an Economic Hit Man* (San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc., 2004).
- , *The Secret History of the American Empire: Economic Hit Men, Jackals, and the Truth about Global Corruption* (New York: Dutton, 2007).
- , *Hoodwinked* (New York: Broadway Books, 2009).
- Phelps, H. P., *Players of a Century: A Record of the Albany Stage* (New York: Edgar S. Werner, 1890).
- Pocock, J. G. A., *Virtue, Commerce, and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).
- , *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1975).
- Pollock, T. C., *The Philadelphia Theatre in the Eighteenth Century* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1933).
- Porter, S. L., *With an Air Debonair: Musical Theatre in America, 1785–1815* (Washington, DC, and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991).
- Postlewait, T., 'From Melodrama to Realism: The Suspect History of American Drama', in M. Hays and A. Nikopoulou (eds), *Melodrama: The Cultural Emergence of a Genre* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1996), pp. 39–60.
- Price, N. W., 'Le Spectacle de la Rue St. Pierre'. *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, 1:3 (January 1918), pp. 221–3.
- Quinn, A. H., *A History of the American Drama from the Beginning to the Civil War* (New York: F. S. Crofts and Co., 1944).
- Rankin, H., *The Theater in Colonial America* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1960).
- Richards, J. H., *Theatre Enough: American Culture and the Metaphor of the World Stage, 1607–1789* (Durham, NC, and London: Duke University Press, 1991).
- Richter, D. K., *The Ordeal of the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1992).
- Robbins, C., *The Eighteenth-Century Commonwealthman: Studies in the Transmission, Development and Circumstance of English Liberal Thought from the Restoration of Charles II until the War with the Thirteen Colonies* (1959; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961).
- Rorabaugh, W. J. *The Alcoholic Republic: An American Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979).
- Rourke, C., *American Humor: A Study of the National Character* (1931; New York, Doubleday-Anchor, 1953).
- Rothenberg, W., *From Marketplaces to Market Economy: The Transformation of Rural Massachusetts, 1750–1850* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1992).
- Rozik, E., *The Roots of Theatre: Rethinking Ritual and Other Theories of Origin* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2002).

- Rumsey, D., *David Rumsey Collection*, 1756, online at www.davidrumsey.com [accessed 1 March 2010].
- Saler, B., 'Supernatural as a Western Category', *Ethos*, 5:1 (1977), pp. 31–53.
- , 'Conceptualizing Religion: Immanent Anthropologists, Transcendent Natives – and Unbounded Categories', in H. G. Kippenberg and E. T. Lawson (eds), *Studies in the History of Religions*, 56 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993).
- Saxon, A. H., *Enter Foot and Horse: A History of Hippodrama in England and France* (New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1968).
- Saxton, A., *The Rise and Fall of the White Republic: Class Politics and Mass Culture in Nineteenth Century America* (London: Verso, 1990).
- Scharf, J. T. and T. Westcott, *History of Philadelphia, 1609–1884*, 3 vols (Philadelphia, PA: L. H. Everts and Co., 1884).
- Schechner, R., *Between Theatre and Anthropology* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985).
- Scott, D., *Refashioning Futures: Criticism after Postcoloniality* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999).
- Shockley, M. S., *The Richmond Stage, 1784–1812* (Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1977).
- Shurcliff, A. W., and S. S. Ingelfinger, *Captive of the Nootka Indians: The Northwest Coast Adventure of John R. Jewitt, 1802–1806* (Boston, MA: Back Bay Books, 1993).
- Silverman, K., *A Cultural History of the American Revolution* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell and Co., 1976).
- Slaughter, T. P., *The Whiskey Rebellion: Frontier Epilogue to the American Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).
- Slotkin, R., *Regeneration through Violence: The Myth of the American Frontier, 1600–1860* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1973).
- , *Fatal Environment: The Myth of the Frontier in the Age of Industrialization, 1800–1890* (New York: Atheneum, 1985).
- , *Gunfighter Nation: The Myth of the Frontier in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Atheneum, 1992).
- , *Lost Battalions: The Great War and the Crisis of American Nationality* (New York: Henry Holt, 2005).
- Smith, H. N., *Virgin Land: The American West as Symbol and Myth* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1950).
- Smither, N., *A History of the English Theatre in New Orleans* (1944; New York: Benjamin Blom, 1967).
- Solomon, N., *War Made Easy: How Presidents and Pundits Keep Spinning Us to Death* (Hoboken, NJ: J. Wiley, 2005).
- Speck, F., *Naskapi: The Savage Hunters of the Labrador Peninsula* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1935).

- Steintrager, J., *Bentham* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977).
- Stoler, A. L., *Haunted by Empire: Geographies of Intimacy in North American History* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006).
- Strand, G., 'The Theater and the Republic', in J. D. Mason, *Performing America: Cultural Nationalism in the American Theatre* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press), pp. 19–36.
- Tanner, A., *Bringing Home Animals: Religious Ideology and Mode of Production of the Mistassini Cree Hunters*, Institute of Social and Economic Research, Social and Economic Studies No. 23. (St John's, Newfoundland: Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1979).
- Taylor, A., *American Colonies* (New York: Viking, 2001).
- Taylor, D., *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003).
- , 'Scenes of Cognition: Performance and Conquest', *Theatre Journal*, 56 (2004), pp. 353–72.
- Tedlock, D. and B. Tedlock (eds), *Teachings from the American Earth: Indian Religion and Philosophy* (New York: Liveright, 1975).
- Thompson, E. P., *The Making of the English Working Class* (New York: Pantheon, 1963).
- Trilling, L., *The Liberal Imagination: Essays on Literature and Society* (New York: Viking Press, 1950).
- Turner, V., *From Ritual to Theatre: The Human Seriousness of Play* (New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications, 1982).
- , *The Anthropology of Performance* (New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications, 1986).
- , 'Are There Universals of Performance in Myth, Ritual and Drama', in R. Schechner and W. Appel (eds), *By Means of Performance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 1–8.
- Unrau, W., *The Rise and Fall of Indian Territory, 1834–1873* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2007).
- Vail, R. W. G., *Random Notes on the History of the Early American Circus* (Barre, MA: Barre Gazette, 1956).
- Valentine, A., *Lord George Germain* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962).
- Van Doren, C., and J. P. Boyd (eds), *Indian Treaties Printed by Benjamin Franklin, 1736–1762* (Philadelphia, PA: The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1938).
- Vernon, G., *Yankee Doodle-Do: A Collection of Songs of the Early American Stage* (New York: Payson and Clarke, Ltd., 1927).
- Waldstreicher, D., *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes: The Making of American Nationalism, 1776–1820* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1997).
- Weisman, J., *Guerilla Theatre: Scenarios for Revolution* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Press, 1973).

- Weltfish, G., *The Lost Universe: Pawnee Life and Culture* (Lincoln, NE and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1965).
- West, E., *The Contested Plains: Indians, Goldseekers, and the Rush to Colorado* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1998).
- White, R., *The Roots of Dependency: Subsistence, Environment, and Social Change among the Choctaws, Pawnees, and Navajos* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1983).
- , *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650–1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
- Wilentz, S., *Chants Democratic: New York City and The Rise of the American Working Class, 1788–1850* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984).
- Willis, E., *The Charleston Stage in the XVIII Century* (Columbia, SC: The State Company, 1924).
- Wilmeth, D. B. (ed.), *Staging the Nation: Plays from the American Theater, 1787–1909* (Boston, MA: Bedford Books, 1998).
- Wilson, G. B., *Three Hundred Years of American Drama and Theatre* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1982).
- Wilson, K., ‘The Performance of Freedom: Maroons and the Colonial Order in Eighteenth-Century Jamaica and the Atlantic Sound’, in *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Series, 66:1 (January 2009), pp. 45–86.
- , ‘The Good, the Bad, and the Impotent: Imperialism and the Politics of Identity in Georgian England’ in A. Bermingham and J. Brewer (eds), *The Consumption of Culture, 1600–1800: Image, Object, Text* (London: Routledge, 1995), pp. 237–62.
- (ed.), *A New Imperial History: Culture, Identity, and Modernity in Britain and the Empire, 1660–1840*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Wilson, K., and L. Brown (eds), *The New Eighteenth Century: Theory, Politics, English Literature* (New York and London: Methuen, 1987).
- Wilson, R., *Ohiyesa: Charles Eastman, Santee Sioux* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1983).
- Winterer, C., ‘Model Empire, Lost City: Ancient Carthage and the Science of Politics in Revolutionary America’, *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, 67:1 (January 2010), pp. 3–30.
- Witthoft, J., *Green Corn Ceremonialism in the Eastern Woodlands* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1949).
- Witke, C., ‘Preface’, in *Tambo and Bones: A History of the American Minstrel Stage*. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1930), p. vii.
- Young, M. E., *Redskins, Ruffleshirts, and Rednecks: Indian Allotments in Alabama and Mississippi, 1830–1860* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1961).

INDEX

- 24, 1
28th of June, The, 80
- Acts of Toleration,
 in Ohio Company promotional literature, 38
Actual Settlement of Eleven Point Gained, 96
- Adams, John, 85, 87
- Agnew, Jean-Christophe, 5–6
- Aiken, George, 171–2
- Aitizart, 129
- Alabama, 142–3, 148–9
- Albany Congress, 35–6
- Albany Gazette*, 106
- Albany, NY, 19, 29, 37, 50, 61, 95, 104, 106–7, 109, 141
- Albany, Treaty of, 27–8, 36–7, 39, 40
- Alder, Jonathan, 43–4, 69–70
- Alfred*, 13, 15
- Alfred, King, 13–15
- Aliquippa, 32
- Alknomook,
 song, 74–5, 84
All the World's a Stage, 94
- Allegheny Mountains, 24, 26, 94
- Allegheny River, 33, 95
- Alsop, Richard, 129
- America Preserved*, 80
- American Company, 15, 59, 67, 103, 106, 107, 108
- American Quarterly Review*, 82
- American Revolution, 25, 51, 54, 67, 71, 87, 105, 123, 133, 147
 as Atlantic world phenomenon, 87
- Americana*, 117
- Amherst, General Jeffrey, 53, 56, 65
 and smallpox blankets, 56, 65
- Ancient Constitution, 17
- Anderson, Fred, 3
- André, Major John, 63, 64, 177
 as character in Dunlap play, 91, 149
- André*, 90
- Anglo-Saxons, 14, 17
- animal lodge, 156–60
- annalistes*, 7
- Antipodean Whirligig, 104
- Appalachian Mountains, 25, 94, 102
- Arkansas Post, 39
- Armourer's Escape, The*, 130, 176
- Arne, Thomas, 13
- Arnold, Benedict, 90
- Astley, Philip, 101–2, 135, 148
- Asylum Company, 94–5
- Bacevich, Andrew, 3
- Bailey, Hackaliah, 134
- Baily, Francis, 70, 94
- Bancroft, George, 147
- Barbé-Marbois, St Pierre Francois, 72
- Bates, Jacob, 102
- Battle of Bunker-Hill*, 86, 89, 90
- Battle of Bunker's Hill, 60, 86
- Battle of Quebec, 54
- Battle of Saratoga, 63
- bear, 44, 46
 in ritual, 21, 56, 57, 129, 134, 159, 160, 161
- bear-baiting, 105, 106
- Beard, Charles, 3
- Beaver River, 72

- Beefsteak Club, 115
 Beler's Campbell Minstrels, 170
 Bentham, Jeremy, 18
 Benton, Thomas Hart, 165
 Berkeley, Reverend George, 17
 Berkhofer, Robert, 3
 Berlin, Ira, 74
 Bermuda, 17
 Bernard, John, 102, 104, 106, 107, 110–24,
 130, 177
 origins, 114–15
 Bernard, W. Bayle, 120
 Bible, 5, 162, 168
 Bienville, Celeron de, 36
 Billy Buttons *see* 'Tailor's Ride to Brentford'
 Black Legend, 53, 140, 143
 Blackbelt region, 149
 Blackface minstrelsy, 127, 148, 171, 173
 'Bleeding' Kansas, 165, 166, 169
Blockade of Boston, The, 60
 Board of Trade, 31, 36, 37
 Bolingbroke, Henry St John, Viscount, 24
Bombastes Furioso, 172
 Boston, 59, 60, 61, 74, 80, 86, 89, 92, 98,
 101–4, 106, 108, 115, 121, 122, 136,
 152
Boston (merchant ship), 128, 130
 Boston 'Massacre', 52
 Brackenridge, Henry Marie, 131, 133
 Brackenridge, Hugh Henry, 52, 133
 Braddock, General William, 18, 57
 Braddock's Field, 136
 British, 20, 22, 24–8, 30–40, 44, 47–52,
 54–64, 66, 67, 71–5, 79, 83, 85, 89,
 90–2, 97, 102, 108, 110, 113, 114, 118,
 122, 132, 133, 139, 146–9, 153, 176
 Brodhead, Daniel, 95
 Brother Jonathan, 75–6, 90–1, 118, 120
 Brown, H. Purdy, 148–9, 151
 Browne, George, Model Dramatic Troupe,
 165
 Burgoyne, General John, 60, 63
 Burk, John Daly, 86–7, 89–90
 Burr, Aaron, 95
 Burt, George, 166–7, 169–70
 Busk *see* Green Corn Ceremony
Busybody, The, 60
 Butler, Picayune, 151
 Butler, Richard, 72
 Caghnawaga *see* Caughnawaga
 Caldwell, James, 135, 151
 Calhoun, John C., 165
 camels,
 in theatrical performance, 101, 104
 Canada, 26, 37, 55, 61, 72, 92, 103, 107,
 109–11, 114–15, 120–2, 131–2, 136,
 177
 Indians of, 47
 Canadagara, 36
 Canadian, 31, 110, 113, 120, 132–3, 136,
 146
 as described by John Bernard, 121
 Canassatego, 29–30, 34, 47
 Canaway River, Great, 45
 capitalism, 2, 110, 136, 153
 captivity narratives, 56, 128–9, 176
 Carthage, 53–4
Castle Spectre, The, 135–6, 138, 140–1
Cato, 54, 61, 88–90, 94
 Caughnawaga, 61
 Ricketts and Durang visit, 111–12
 Cayton, Andrew, 3
 Ceremonies *see* performance, indigenous;
 'Condolence Ceremony'; 'Edge of the
 Woods Ceremony'; 'Green Corn Cer-
 emony'; 'Shaking Tent Ceremony'
 Charleston, SC, 66, 80, 86, 90, 123
 Charlestown, MA, 60–1
 Charlevoix, Pierre, 20–1
 Chattahoochee Falls, 143
 Chattahoochee River, 141–2
 Cherokees, 50–1, 74, 84
 in Britain, 102
 Chestnut Street Theatre, 94, 115
 Chillicothe, Ohio, 133–4
 Chouteau, Auguste, 165
 Christian, 5, 14, 38, 45–6, 58, 61, 71, 89,
 137, 139, 147, 155, 157, 162
 Christianity, 61
 influence of, 4, 5, 46
 Cincinnati, OH, 127, 135, 144, 150–1
 Cincinnatus, 81, 90
 Circus, 58, 98, 101–3, 105, 107–11, 113–
 15, 117, 119, 121, 123–5, 127, 133–6,
 147–8, 150–1, 161–4, 166, 172, 177
 opposition to, 106, 133–4
 Civil War, 9, 54, 120, 161, 166

- Clark, George Rogers, 55, 59, 72–3
 Cleveland, OH, 21
 Clinton, General Henry, 63–6
 Cockings, George, 55
 cognitive dissonance, 123, 145, 171, 173
 cognitive studies, 7–9
 Coke, Sir Edward, 17
 Coleman, George, 77
 Coleridge, Samuel, 130
 colonial/indigenous paradigm, 5–10, 13,
 22, 23, 25, 40, 47–52, 54, 56–8, 66,
 69, 113
 colonial world view 1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 15, 16,
 19–28, 31, 32, 35–40, 44, 55, 58, 59,
 61–3, 66, 69, 71–3, 75, 87, 92, 105,
 106, 111, 113, 127, 133, 149, 156, 159,
 161, 168, 175, 176
 defined, 2, 4, 6
Columbian Centinel, 101
 Columbian Exchange, 78
 Columbus, 53
 Columbus, GA, 127, 141–3, 149, 163
 Conajohary, 37
 Condolence Ceremony, 22–3, 25–6, 32,
 35–7, 40, 50–1
 adopted by whites, 23, 25, 73, 176
 described, 23
 Conewango Creek, 95
 Confederation Congress, 72–3
Conquest of Canada, The, 55
Contrast, The, 74–6, 84
 Cooper, Thomas Abthorpe, 104
 Cooptee, community of, 128
 Corn Mother, 41–67
 Cornwallis, Lord, 63–4
 Covenant Chain, 28–9, 37, 72
 Coweta Town, 143
 Cree, 46
 Creek Indians, 41, 141–3, 163
 see also ‘Muskoghean’
 Croghan, George, 44, 69
 Crowninshield, Jacob, 150
 cultural history, 10
 culture, 5–9, 10, 17, 19, 25, 46, 60, 74, 62,
 86–7, 107, 113, 131, 147, 150–1, 153,
 162, 165, 176
 bourgeois, 63, 104, 124, 166
 of empire, 2, 4, 6–9, 14–15, 17–18, 21,
 47, 53, 56, 61–2, 65–7, 69, 74–5, 77,
 86, 92, 94, 102,, 105, 110, 112–14,
 118, 124, 127, 133, 135–6, 140,
 142–3, 147–8, 150–1, 154, 161, 164,
 172, 176
 folk, 42–9, 92, 103, 112, 127, 142, 152,
 177
 Greek and Roman, 101
 indigenous, 2, 4, 10, 20, 35, 46, 47, 52,
 69–71, 87, 112, 127, 131, 133, 162,
 176
 market, 18, 21, 25, 48, 99
 Cumberland Gap, 146
 Cumfer, Cynthia, 4
Darby's Return, 118
Death of Captain Cook, 111
Death Song of the Cherokee Indians, 74, 84
 Deceit, institutionalized in empire, 4, 25, 28,
 38, 176
 Declaration of Independence,
 signatories, 16
 Declaratory Act, 52
 Deganawidah, 23–4
 Delaware, 80
 Delaware Indians, 53, 66, 72, 83, 164
 Demin, Kate, 171
 Den Stone's Circus, 162
 Detroit, 39, 46, 55
 Dinwiddie, Robert, 27, 31, 39
 Dionysus,
 parade in honour of, 101
 Doctor Lodge (Pawnee), 158, 160
 Doctors' Grand Opera (Pawnee), 157–9
 Doddridge, Joseph, 144–5
 Doolen, Andy, 3
 Douglass, David, 15, 59
 Douglass, Frederick, 154
 Drake, Samuel, 148
 Drinker, Elizabeth, diary of, 65
Drunkard, The, 167–8, 170
 Drury Lane, 136
 Dryden, John, 18
 Dudley, Dorothy, 90
 Dunlap, William, 76–7, 80–3, 86, 90–1,
 96–8, 103–5, 107–9, 117–18, 124,
 130, 135, 140, 149, 151, 169, 177

- Durang, John, 102–3, 107, 114, 121, 163
 joins American Company, 108
 joins Ricketts's Circus, 109–10
 Canadian tour, 110–13
 performances in rural Pennsylvania, 114
 Durant's New England Bards, 170
 Dutch, 19–20, 27
 as described by John Bernard, 120
 in indigenous histories, 29
 in New York, 109
 Pennsylvania 'Dutch', 107, 114
 in song, 91
- Easton Treaty, 39–40
 Edge of the Woods Ceremony, 13, 19–23, 32
 Egyptian circus, 101
El Hyder, 148
 electricity, displays of, 104
 embodiment, in cognitive studies, 7–8
 empire
 advocates of, 116
 American, 1, 3, 52–3, 55, 60, 69, 72, 74, 86–9, 91–2, 99, 105, 107, 112, 131, 133, 135, 142, 145, 154, 163–4, 166, 168, 172, 176–7
 benevolent, 79
 British, 2, 13–17, 24, 26, 36, 38–39, 48, 54–5, 57, 61–3, 66–7, 74, 79, 85, 97, 99, 104, 124, 148, 173, 176
 and the circus, 101, 103, 116, 177
 and the Civil War, 163, 166, 171–2
 and class, 153, 166
 classical, 16, 101–2
 commercial, 2, 5–7, 13–14, 18–19, 49, 52–4, 61, 81–3, 87, 92–4, 98–9, 124–5, 127, 133, 136, 139, 143, 149–50, 164, 166, 168, 172, 175
 defined, 2
 and Danes, 15
 European, 27, 35, 87, 176
 French, 36, 39, 61, 72
 and gender, 3, 4, 138, 140
 global, 17, 175
 history of, 1, 3–4, 35, 150
 micro, 52
 and race, 127, 131, 133, 135, 140, 143, 145–6, 153–4
 Spanish, 53, 140
 and view towards Indians, 71
 wars of, 25, 39, 51, 61–2, 66, 116
 see also culture, of empire
 English, 6, 7, 22–3, 29, 313, 33–9, 44, 47, 56–9, 61, 71, 75, 77, 82, 89, 91, 104, 107, 110, 149
 missionaries, 22
 English 'Country' Radicals, 16
 Enlightenment, 2–3, 157
 epistemology, 7–9
 Erie, Lake, 5, 20–1, 35, 73, 95
 Erie Triangle, 95
 Ethrington, George, 47
 Evening Star (Pawnee medicine bundle), 155, 157
 Ewing, George, 61
- Fair Penitent, The*, 62
 Fallen Timbers, Battle of, 131
 Faneuil Hall, 60
 Federal Street Theatre, 86, 104, 115
 Federalists, 93, 98
 Fink, Mike, 147, 152
 First Continental Congress, 59
 Fiske, John, 147
 folktales, 19, 136, 149, 168
 folksongs, 18, 168
 food, and mythology, 10, 21, 34, 41, 43–4, 93, 96, 129, 137, 142, 155, 159, 162, 175
 Forks of the Ohio, 31, 33, 45, 92, 95
 Forrest, Edwin, 135, 145–7, 151, 162
 Fort Cavagnial, 39
 Fort Duquesne, 13, 39
 Fort George, 36
 Fort Leavenworth, 164, 171
 Fort McIntosh, 72
 Fort Orange, 19
 Fort Pitt, 95, 164
 Fort Stanwix
 1768, Treaty of, 49–52, 55
 1784, Treaty of, 71–3
 Fort Sullivan, 80
 Fort Vincennes, 59
 Foucault, Michel, 9–10
 France, 13, 39, 64, 149
 Franklin,
 as name for a new colony/state, 51, 92

- Franklin, Benjamin, 16, 49
 Franklin, William, 50
 Franks, Becky, 62
 free-soilers, 138, 163
 Fremont, NE, 157
 French, 14, 20, 22, 24–8, 30–1, 33–40, 44, 46–9, 51, 53, 56–7, 59, 61–3, 66, 72, 111
 ambassador to the US, first, 108
 Bernard, John described by, 121
 circus, 166
 Durang, John, father of, 107
 French-Indian relations on frontier, 133
 and melodrama, 130
 pro-French sentiment in US, 92
 radicals, 93
 at Treaty of Paris, 1763, 71
 French-Indian War, 14, 22, 24, 40, 48, 51, 53, 62–3, 66, 110
 Freneau, Philip, 52, 177
 Frontier, 1, 4–5, 7, 13, 24–6, 35, 38–40, 44, 47–8, 50–2, 55, 59, 69, 74–6, 83–4, 87, 92–3, 96, 101, 105–7, 116, 127, 131, 141, 145, 152, 162, 166–8, 170, 173, 176–7

 Gabay's Dramatic Troupe, 165
 Gage, General Thomas, 50–1, 57
 Garrick, David, 115
 Garrison, William Lloyd, 145
George Barnwell *see* *London Merchant, The*
 George Barnwell, Ballad of, 18
 George III, 24, 28, 31
 Germain, Lord George, 63
 Germany, 19, 103
 Gilje, Paul, 49
 Gist, Christopher, 30–2
 Glen Elder, dam and reservoir, 157
Glory of Columbia, Her Yeomanry!, 90, 96
 Gnadenhütten, 177
 Gold rush, Kansas Territory, 171
 Goldsmith, Oliver, 87, 115
 Gordon, Robert, 8
 Grand Ohio Company, 50
 Great Awakening, and 'enthusiasm' in theatre, 87
 Great Awakening, Second, 168
 Great Lakes, 27, 36, 47, 55, 71, 147

 Great Philadelphia Zoological Garden, 161
 Greeley, Horace, 171
 Green Corn Ceremony, 10, 40–3, 45, 177
 Greenwich Street Theatre, circus in, 103, 108
 Grinnell, George Bird, 160
 Gros Loup, 57
 Grouffe, Monsieur, 135
 Gun dance *see* Green Corn Ceremony
Gustavas Vasa, 89
 Guthrie, Abelard, 165

 Hale, Horatio, 22–3
 Half-King, 33–5, 37, 39, 73
 see also Tanaghrisson
 Hall, Catherine, 3
 Hallam, Lewis, 15, 67
 Hallam, Lewis, Jr., 107–8
 Hallowell, A Irving, 6–7, 21, 44, 71
 Hamilton, Alexander, 87, 93
 Hamilton, General Henry, 55–59
 Hamilton, James, 39
 'Happy Indians', 69, 83
 harlequin, 76, 111
 Harrington, James, 16
 Hart, F. Elizabeth, 7–8
 Hatton, Anne Julia Kemble, 82–3, 146
 Haymarket Theatre
 Boston, 86, 89
 London, 77
 Hays, Chief Constable Jacob, 152
 Hellenism, 5
 Hendrick, 37
 Henry, John, 15
 Hewitt, James, 83, 128
 Hiawatha, 23
High Life Below Stairs, 96
 Hodgkinson, John, 82–3
 Hogarth, William, 115
 Holland Company, 95
 Hopkinson, Francis, 16
 Howe, General William, 62–5
 Hudson River, 27, 109
 Hudson Valley, 61, 104, 106
 Hughes, Charles, 102
 Hussein, Saddam, 1

- Independence, MO, 161
 Indian Country, 13, 49, 97, 130
 Indian Territory, 149, 162–5
 Indigenous performance, adapted to theatre stage, 130–1
 see also performance, indigenous
 indigenous/colonial paradigm, 6–7, 9, 13, 17, 20–1, 40, 44, 46, 55–9, 97, 105, 112, 176
Inkle and Yarico, 77, 79, 86, 107, 123, 127, 177
 Intolerable Acts, 60
 Iroquois, 5, 20, 22–5, 27–30, 32, 35–7, 39, 50, 61
Iroquois Book of Rites, 22
 Irwin, Lee, 6

 Jackson, Andrew, 142, 146
 Jacksonian democracy, 132, 139–40, 146, 152
 Jacobins, as label for westerners, 86, 93
 Jacobsen, Rolf, 178
 James, Alfred, 31
Jayhawkers on the Stage, 172
 Jesus, 24
 Jewitt, John R., 128, 130
 Jim Crow, 148, 150–4, 164, 177
Jocko, or, The Brazilian Ape, 135
 John Street Theatre, 74, 90, 102–3, 108, 130
 Johnson, Mark, 8
 Johnson, Sir William, 22, 49–51, 92
 Jonathan *see* Brother Jonathan
 Jones, Dorothy V., 4

 Kansa Indians, 165
 Kansas, 157, 165–7
 see also 'Bleeding' Kansas
 Kansas City, 39
 Kansas House Hotel, 164
 Kansas Territory, 163–4, 167, 169, 173
Kansas Weekly Herald, 169
 Kansas–Nebraska Act, 163, 169
 Kaplan, Amy, 3
 Kaskaskia, 39, 164
 Kenny, James, 44–6
 Kentucky, 105, 131–2, 135, 150
 Kentucky Boat, 70
 Kickapoo, 133

 King George's War, 26, 30, 36
 King Philip, 146
 Klaizzarts, 130
 Klein, Lawrence, 116
 Klock, George, 50
 Kotzebue, August von, 140

 Lacrosse, 42, 47
 Lafayette, LA, 150
 Lafayette, Marquis de, 72
 Lake Champlain, 61, 106, 109, 120
 Lakoff, George, 8
 Lakota, 176
 Lamar, Mirabeau B., 141
 Lamb, Charles, 130
 Lancaster, 48, 107, 114
 Lancaster Treaty, 25–31, 33–4, 37, 39, 51
Leavenworth Daily Conservative, 171
Leavenworth Daily Times, 171
 Leavenworth Theatre, 166
 Leavenworth, KS, 164–73
 Lee, Arthur, 72
 Legion of the United States, 93
 Leslie, William, 47
 Lewis, Montgomery Gregory (M. G.), 136
 Lexington, Battle of, 60
 Lexington, KY, 105, 127, 135, 141
 liberalism, 17
 Liberty, MO, 161
Life among the Happy, 171
Life of a Woman in the Mines, or, Adventures at Pike's Peak, 171
Like Master Like Man, 96
 Lochaber, Treaty of, 51–2, 55
Logan, Last of the Race of Shikellimus, 144–5
 Logstown, 37
 see also Treaty of Logstown
 London, 15–18, 30, 36–7, 50–2, 55, 61–3, 70, 77, 82, 92, 102–4, 107, 115, 136, 148, 177
 London Company, 15
London Merchant, The, 18–19, 107
 London Royal Circus, 102
 Long Knives, 71
 longhouses, 20, 36
 Lott, Eric, 8
 Louisiana, 133, 149
 Louisville, KY, 30, 127, 141, 148, 150–1

- Loup River, 157
 Loyal Company, 51
 Ludlow, Noah, 146, 148–51, 169, 177
 Ludlow and Smith Theatre Co., 146, 169, 177
 Mabie's Circus, 163
 Mack-a-Chack, 69
 McConachie, Bruce, 7–9
 McConnell, Michael, 40
 McCoy, Isaac, 165
 McCullough, John, 45
 Madison, James, 52, 98
 Mahican Channel, 61, 106
 Maine, 11, 134
 Maquina, 128–30
 market
 abstract, 5–6, 48, 116
 economy, 2, 5, 46, 80, 92–3, 98, 102–3, 108, 110, 114, 127, 131, 143, 168
 and resources, 3–4, 7, 14, 16, 39, 55, 141
 and theatre, 5–6, 69, 77
 Maryland, 17, 25, 28–30, 35, 62
 Mason, George, 17, 31, 38
 Mason's Lodge, 164
 Mason-Dixon Line, 15, 80
 massacre
 Boston *see* Boston Massacre
 of Moravian Indians, 92, 177
 Maumee River, 55, 73
 Mediterranean, 4, 17, 24, 53, 101
 Mediterranean System, 5
 Melodeon Hall, Leavenworth, K. T., 166, 169–70
 melodrama, 19, 80, 82, 103, 127, 130–1, 133, 135–7, 140–1, 143, 147–8, 168–9, 171, 177
 menagerie, 94, 101, 105, 107, 127, 135, 147, 161–5, 177
 Menhwehna, 47
 mercantilism, 2
 Meschianza *see* Mischianza
 Mestayer, Emily, 169
 Mestayer, Louis J., 170
 Metacom, 146
Metamora, 135, 145–7, 162
 Métis, 133
 Miami Indians, 25, 33, 35–6, 39, 57, 70
 Miami River, 73
 Michilimackinac, 47, 49
 Mills, John, 121–2
 Mingo Indians, 25
 Mischianza, 62–6, 91
 Mississippi, 150
 Mississippi River, 26, 39, 70, 94, 125, 146, 149, 161, 163, 165–6, 184
 Missouri, 161–3, 165, 169–70
 Missouri River, 39, 94, 161, 163–4, 166, 171
 Missouri Valley, 165–69
 Missouri Indians, 165
 Mobile, AL, 127, 148–50
 Mohawk Indians, 22, 36–7, 49, 61
 Mokesin, James, 46
 Monacatootha, 35
 Montour, Andrew, 31, 33–5
 Montreal, 39, 61–2, 107, 109–3, 121–2, 163
 Moravian Indians, 75, 93
 Morning Star (Pawnee Indian Medicine Bundle), 156
 Morris, Robert, 66, 94–5, 103
 in debtors' prison, 104
 Morrison, Kenneth M., 6
 Moultrie, General William, 80
 Muscogee County, 141
 Muskingham River, 75
 Muskogee Indians, 41, 141–3, 163
 see also Creek Indians
 Muskogean, pre-Columbian, 149
 myth, mythology, myth-making, 1, 3, 11, 13, 15, 19, 23–4, 40, 46, 52, 54–5, 57, 60, 71, 74, 80–1, 85–6, 90, 97, 118, 124, 127, 145–7, 155, 157, 161, 168–9, 176
 Nathans, Heather, 98
 Near East, 4, 17, 21, 46
 Nebraska, 155, 157, 160, 165
 Neihardt, John G., 175
 Neolin, 44–6, 51, 131
New England Chronicle, 60
 New France, 6
 New Hampshire, 35
New Hampshire Gazette, 14
 New Jersey, 50, 66
 New Jersey, College of, 16, 52
 New Orleans, 39, 135, 141, 149, 151, 153
 New Theatre over the Allegheny, 96

- New York, 1, 20–1, 27, 29–30, 36–7, 40, 61, 63, 72, 74, 76, 80–2, 86, 90, 95, 97–8, 102–4, 108, 113, 115, 130–2, 134–5, 152, 168, 171
- Niagara, 39, 132, 136
- Nichols, David Andrew, 4
- Nichols, George, 151
- Nicholson, John, 95
- Noble Savage, 86, 147, 162
- Nootka Indians, 128–30
- North American Land Company, 94
- North, Major Frank, 159
- Nugent, Walter, 3
- Nussbaum, Felicity, 3
- objectivism, 8–9
- Oceana*, 16
- Oceana, character in *Metamora*, 146–7
- Ohio Company, 24–8, 30–1, 33–5, 37, 50–1, 92, 176
- Ohio River, 13, 25, 31, 35–6, 38–9, 44–5, 51, 69, 72–3, 92, 132
- Ohio Valley, 24, 26, 31–2, 115, 127, 131, 135, 138, 150
- Ojibwa, 7, 20, 47, 56, 711–2
- Old Corn Meal, 151
- Oneida, 20
- Onondaga, 32, 34–6, 39
- Onontio, 72
- Osage, 165
- Oswego, 37, 72
- Orbello*, 123
- Othello, 76
- 'other-than-human-persons', 40, 43, 46–7, 56, 71, 99, 129, 131, 155, 176
- Otoe Indians, 165
- Ottawa Indians, 72
- Padlock, The*, 62, 96, 123, 151
- pantomime, 103, 107, 111, 113–14, 127, 135
- Park Theatre, 104
- Parkville, MO, 163
- Pawnees, 44, 155–7, 159–61, 165, 172, 176
- Paxton Boys, 48–9, 65, 75, 145, 277
- Paxton Boys, The*, 49
- Payne, John Howard, 42–3
- Peacemaker *see* Deganiwidah
- Pease, Donald, 3
- Penn, John, 40, 48
- Penn, William, 29, 40, 65–6, 83
- Pennsylvania, 25–7, 29–31, 33, 38–40, 41, 48–9, 66, 72–3, 75, 92–6, 107, 130–2, 134, 145
- Pennsylvania 'Dutch', 114
- Pennsylvania Gazette*, 13
- Pennsylvania Population Company, 94
- Penobscot Indians, 134
- performance, 1–2, 5, 8, 10, 13, 44, 47–9, 54, 69–70, 74–6, 87, 92–3, 104–5, 115, 127, 135, 142, 150, 147, 150–51, 164
- cognitive studies, and, 8
- colonial, 13, 19, 26, 40, 51–2, 60, 62, 124, 150
- Indians on the theatre stage, 141–2, 149, 163
- indigenous, 6, 13, 19–23, 40–3, 45–6, 50, 55–9, 70–1, 105, 112, 128–31, 136, 141, 155–61, 173 175–6
- see also* Green Corn Ceremony; Condolence Ceremony; Edge of the Woods Ceremony; Shaking Tent Ceremony
- 'red-face', 112–13, 163, 173
- song, 15, 22–3, 42, 44–5, 55–6, 58–9, 74–5, 82–9, 91, 103, 111, 117, 130, 132, 136, 142, 150–3, 158, 160, 162, 164, 167–8, 177
- spectrum of, 4, 8, 13, 67, 102, 104, 106, 136, 176–7
- student, 25, 52, 176
- treaty, 13, 24–9, 32, 34–8, 40, 51, 71, 73
- see also* blackface minstrelsy; circus; melodrama; pantomime theatre
- performance studies, 8
- Perkins, John, 2
- Philadelphia, 13, 25, 27, 49, 59, 62–3, 65–6, 74, 80–3, 86, 90–2, 94–6, 98, 102–4, 107–8, 113, 115, 130, 133, 145, 161
- College of, 13, 15
- Company, 113, 115
- Piankashaw, 25
- Pickawillany, 36
- Pittsburgh, 31, 72, 75, 92–4, 96, 141
- Pittsburgh Gazette*, 96
- Pizarro*, 135, 140–1, 143–5, 163, 168

- Placide, Alexander, 80, 103, 105
 Planters, 14, 138, 149
 John Bernard's apologetica for, 122–3
 Platte City, MO, 161
 Platte River, 5, 157
 Pocock, J. G. A., 54
 Pontiac, 46
 Pontiac's Rebellion, 46, 48, 50–1
Poor Soldier, The, 81
 Poskita *see* Green Corn Ceremony
 postcolonialism, 6
 postmodern relativity, 8
 Potawatomie, 21
 Potomac River, 26–7, 37
 Powell, Charles Stuart, 69
Pre-emption, The, 96
 Princeton *see* New Jersey, College of
 Proclamation Line of 1763, 55
 Prophet, The *see* Tenskwatawa
 Puritanism, 45, 54, 65, 76, 136
 Putnam, General Israel, 86

 Quakers, 65–6,
 Quebec, 39
 Battle of, 54
 Quebec City, 62, 107, 110, 121–2, 163

 refugees, indigenous, 25, 47, 143, 164
 Republicanism
 Classical, 17, 115
 Euro-American, 52, 54, 76, 89, 92, 99,
 106–7, 124–5, 136
 Rice, Thomas Dartmouth, 148, 150–52,
 164, 177
 Richelieu Valley, 61
 Richmond, MO, 161
 Richmond, VA, 122
 Ricketts, John Bill, 101–11, 113–14, 121,
 124, 135, 148, 177
 ritual *see* performance, indigenous
Robinson Crusoe, 111, 129
 Romanticism, 103, 130–1, 136, 139
 Rome, 16–17, 53–4, 88–9, 101–2
 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 48

 St Genevieve, 133
 St Joseph, MO, 161, 166–7
 St Patrick's Day, 164

 Saler, Benson, 8
 Sands, Nathan and Company, 166
 Santa Fe Trail, 164
 Schoepf, Johann David, 75
School for Scandal, The, 74, 76, 107
 Schuylkill Fishing Company, 83
 Scotch-Irish, 48
 Scott, D. L., 169–70
 Scott, David, 6
 Seneca Indians, 32, 36, 72
 Shaking Tent Ceremony, 46
 Shanaghrisson, 37
 Shanopin Town, 21–32
 Shawnee Indians, 26, 30–3, 35, 43–5, 53,
 69, 131, 165
 Sheridan, Richard, 74
 Simulation in Cognitive Studies, 7–9
 Six Nations, 22, 25–40, 50–1, 72
 Skimmington, 48
 Skull Bundle (Pawnee), 156
 slaves, 9, 15, 19, 64, 76, 81, 99, 101, 116,
 123, 138, 140, 143, 152–3
 buying and selling, 19
 Slotkin, Richard, 3
 smallpox blankets, 53, 56, 65
 Smith, Henry Nash, 3
 Smith, Solomon, 132–3, 135–6, 139–43,
 146–7 150–1, 163
 Smith, W. H., 168
 Smith, William, 15
 Smith's Theatre, St Joseph, MO, 167
 Solee, J. J. L., 90
 Solomon River, 157
 Somers, NY, 134
 songs *see* performance, songs
Songs of Tammany, The, 82
 Sons of Liberty, 52
 Sons of St Tammany *see* Tammany Society
 South Sea Company, 18, 116
 Southwark Theatre, 90, 108, 111
 Speck, Frank, 6
Spectator, The, 77
 spectrum *see* performance, spectrum
 Stamp Act, 52, 55, 93, 152
 Stansell, Christine, 9
 Star and Garter Tavern, London, 102
 Stevenson, Robert Louis, 129
 Stoler, Ann Laura, 3

- Stone, John Augustus, 145
 Stowe, Harriet Beecher, 171–2
 Strand, Ginger, 89, 98
 Sunbury, PA, 134
 supernatural, 111
 difference between indigenous and colonial views of, 20
 in indigenous belief systems, 7, 21, 157, 175
 Susquehanna Indians, 30, 48–9
 Susquehanna Region, 26, 39, 44

 ‘Tailor’s Ride to Brentford’, 102, 110
 Tamany Buck, 32
Tamerlane, 60
 Tammany, 83
 Tammany Society, 33–4, 37
 Tanaghrisson, 47, 48, 49, 54
 see also ‘Half-King’
 Tanner, Adrian, 6, 46
 Tecumseh, 131–2, 142
 Teedyuscung, 39
 Tenskawatawa, 131, 142
 Territorial Company, 4
 theatre
 ban on, 60
 opposition to, 16, 134
 see also performance, theatre
 Thespian Hotel, 104
 Thompson, John, 128
 Thomson, James, 13
 Thoreau, Henry David, 10
 Thunderbirds, 69, 71, 177
Toodles, 170
 Toronto, 136
 Townshend Act, 52
Translatio Studii, 16
 Treaties, indigenous view of, 25, 73
 Treaty of Aix-La-Chapelle, 36
 Treaty of Aix-La-Chappelle, 39
 Treaty of Albany, 27–8
 Treaty of Greenville, 131
 Treaty of Lancaster, 25–8, 30–1, 33–4, 37
 Treaty of Logstown, 28, 30–2, 34, 36, 51
 Treaty of Paris (1763), 44
 Treaty of Paris (1783), 71
 Trent, William, 56
 Trilling, Lionel, 3

Trip to Presque’isle, 96
 Trois Rivières, 122
 Trumbull, John, 86
 Turner, Frederick Jackson, 147
 Turner, Victor, 23
 Twightwees *see* Miamis Indians
 Tyler, Royall, 74, 118, 120

Uncle Tom’s Cabin, 146, 172
 Uncle Tomahawk, 165
 Union Theatre, Leavenworth, K. T., 167, 170
 United States, 2–3, 72, 74, 79, 94, 97–8, 102, 107, 109, 115, 130, 147, 169–70
 Unrau, William, 165
 Usher, Luke, Mr and Mrs, 121–2
 Utilitarianism, 18

 Valley Forge, 61–2, 177
 Van Amburgh, Isaac A., 162
 Vancouver Island, 128
 ‘Vanishing Indians’, 74, 76, 83
 Vietnam War, 1
 Vincennes, 55
 Virginia, 24–8, 30–35, 37–8, 51, 57–8, 72, 87, 119, 131, 144, 171

 Wabash River, 59
 Wall and Ryan, 108
 Wampanoag, 145–7
Wampum belts, 24–5, 30, 33, 36
 Warren, General Joseph, 86, 88–9
 Washburn’s Great American Colossal Circus, 164
 Washington
 Augustine, 30
 Washington, George, 14, 30, 39, 60–1, 63, 81, 88–9, 91, 96–7, 103, 124, 164, 168
 Washington, Lawrence, 30
 Wayne, General Anthony, 93, 95
 Wea Indians, 25, 164
 Weiser, Conrad, 33
 Well’s Minstrels, 164
 Weltfish, Gene, 6, 156–7, 160, 176
 West Florida, 149
 Westport, MO, 161
 Wheeler, Ben, 172
 Wheeling, VA, 144

- Whiskey Rebellion, 92–3, 96
White, Richard, 55
Who's the Dupe, 96
Wignell, Thomas, 81, 104, 113, 115
Wild West show, 162
Wilderness Road, 70
Wilkes, John, 115
Williamsburg, VA, 15
Williamson, David, 75, 93
Williamson, John B., 86
Wilson, Kathleen, 3
Winchester Treaty, 35
Wittke, Carl, 154, 203, 223
Wolcott, Oliver, 72
Wolfe, General James, 54
Wyoming Valley, 30, 39
Yankee Doodle, as satire, 117
Yankees, 60, 91, 132
 defined by John Bernard, 118–20
York, PA, 107–8, 136
Yorktown, 63, 80, 190
Zara, 60

